
00020590

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

MEMOIR.


00020590

1875

JOSEPH MAZZINI:

A MEMOIR.

20590
5-2 4690

CHAPTER I.

CHILDHOOD: FIRST IMPRISONMENT. 1805 TO 1831.

THOSE among the working people who already know the name of Joseph Mazzini, probably know of him little more than the fact that it was through his genius, energy, and devotion that his countrymen were roused to resent the shame and degradation of foreign rule; to shake off the yoke of Austria and of the petty Italian Princes who ruled the separate States into which their country was divided, and to win back Italy for the Italians. And this, indeed, he achieved; amid sorrows, difficulties, dangers, and discouragements which must have crushed a soul less penetrated than his with what he himself has termed "the religion of the Fatherland;" but this alone, although the example of patriotism so exalted is ennobling to us all, would furnish no special reason for addressing the following scanty and imperfect record of this great man to the working-class. All Englishmen worthy the name would lay down their lives rather than tamely allow any foreign usurper to seize possession of their Island home, and can therefore heartily sympathize with the noble Italian pride which urged Mazzini to the liberation of his native land; but his patriotism was based upon something far higher than pride. As William Lloyd

Garrison has truly said, "Patriotism is a passion or a sentiment which has narrow boundaries;" but, he adds, "although Mazzini's love of his native land was like fire in his bones, and her pressing needs largely absorbed his thoughts and energies, yet her political enfranchisement, based upon intelligence and virtue, was with him but the prelude to the deliverance of all Europe. Had I seen in him simply the devotion of an Italian in behalf of his oppressed countrymen, however unselfishly displayed, I should not have formed that exalted estimate of him which I shall ever cherish. Such devotion is commendable, but it does not embrace mankind. It was because his soul was full-orbed, his love of liberty unlimited by considerations of race or clime, that I felt drawn to him by an irresistible magnetism. In him there was not discoverable one spark of self-inflation, one atom of worldly ambition, one symptom of narrowness towards any people. Spherical as the globe, he deprecated 'that spirit of nationalism which retards the progress of our intellectual life by isolating it from the universal life palpitating among the millions of our brethren abroad.'"

Mazzini, in fact, believed it to be our duty to love and reverence our fatherland as the home wherein God has placed us, among brothers and sisters linked to us by the family ties of a common religion, history, and language. The separate nations were, in his eyes, the separate families of humanity; and even as no man can completely fulfil his duties as a father, who fails in the higher duty he owes to his country; so no man can rightly fulfil his duties as a patriot, who fails in the higher duty he owes to humanity. He believed that the Almighty has indicated the special function and duty of each separate people, by certain special faculties

and aptitudes bestowed upon each; precisely as the boundaries of the homes marked out for the different nationalities, are indicated by broad distinctions of language, character, and tendency, and "by geographical signs and limits traced by the finger of God." *

The question of the Nationalities, as it is called, of the right of each nation to absolute freedom in the management of its own internal affairs, was sacred in his eyes on precisely the same grounds on which individual liberty is sacred. Nations, like individuals, have each a divinely-appointed and distinct task to perform: self-development and responsibility are essential to the right fulfilment of that task, and self-development and responsibility are alike impossible without freedom. The separate European families—the nations—he believed to be destined in the future to constitute the State or Commonwealth of Europe, precisely as separate provinces and townships constitute the State or Commonwealth of each different nation. Consequently, a just settlement of the question of the nationalities was the necessary first step towards an equitable "balance of power" among them; towards a future "holy alliance," not of kings, but of peoples; and towards a just organization of the common labour which the peoples of Europe have to accomplish for the benefit of humanity.

Nations, like individuals, must be free before they can be responsible for their actions. God, by kindling in the hearts of all men the sanctuary-lamp of Conscience, has imposed upon each the duty of walking by its light;

* The reader must understand that I only avoid the use of marks of quotation when compelled, for the sake of brevity, to summarize Mazzini's teachings and opinions in my own words. The ideas expressed throughout this notice are wholly his own; my part is simply that of the necessarily darkened camera, wherein the image of his thought is given in little.

and liberty, which gives us the power of choosing between good and evil, is "not the right to choose evil, but the right of choice between the various paths that lead to good." This right is the natural right of every human being, without distinction of sex or class, because upon it depends all voluntary and responsible obedience to the law of God. Monarchies and aristocracies are therefore destined, by the nature of things, to pass away, and gradually to give place to the people—the nation. The word nation will in the future signify a brotherhood, living individually and socially by the fruits of its own labour, seeking to realize the greatest possible amount of general well-being, without violating the sacred rights of individual responsibility, and bound together by community of affections, historic memories, and religion.

The nation thus transformed into one individual Entity, will recognize neither castes nor privileges, save those of genius and virtue; neither *proletariat* nor aristocracy; but simply an aggregate of forces and faculties, each voluntarily consecrated to the well-being of all; to the just administration of the common substance and possession—the native land. And even thus, in the remote but certain future, will the various nations, or families of Humanity, form a vaster, but equally indivisible Entity; "recognising neither empires nor monarchies, neither first-rate nor second-rate Powers, but simply an aggregate of national forces and faculties, of free and harmonious peoples, each voluntarily consecrated to the well-being of all, and sharing in the just administration of the common substance and possession—the terrestrial globe."

* *

In the days when the victorious despots of Europe, having met together in "*Holy Alliance*," had rivetted

afresh the chains of nations; when "the sky was dark, the heavens void, and the peoples motionless in stupor," —in the mid-hour of that starless night of tyranny, one Italian voice broke the shameful silence of fear, crying aloud: "THE PEOPLES HAVE NO MASTER BUT GOD, NO RULER BUT HIS LAW."

Mazzini's whole life was consecrated to the fulfilment of the duty involved in these words. The device, GOD AND THE PEOPLE, which he inscribed upon the banner of Rome during the brief, glorious Republic of 1849, was the summary of his religious and political faith, the outward and visible manifestation of his soul. Prophet of the People, he devoted himself to their service: to the duty of educating and sanctifying them for the high mission which he believed them consecrated by the Almighty to achieve in the future.

This devotion to the cause of the suffering millions, founded upon his belief in the oneness of Humanity, was the source of his abhorrence of every privilege not based upon superiority of virtue and intellect, and of his faith in the holiness of nationality and the sacredness of labour, and it is for this reason that the little I have here to tell of his character and purpose is addressed to those toilers of the earth whom he loved and served so well.

I cannot pretend to offer you any complete representation of the great spirit that so lately dwelt amongst us. To do this, it would be necessary to write a minute and exhaustive record of a long life of sorrow, struggle, and sacrifice, which I am alike unable and unworthy to recount. The faithful biographer of Mazzini must relate, not only his history, but the history of the times in which he lived. I can but faintly sketch a few

shadowy and imperfect outlines of his grand and mournful career.

Owing to the fact that the astonishing influence he exercised, not only over his own countrymen, but over the whole democracy of Europe, was mysteriously exerted and chiefly from a distance, his contemporaries—compelled to judge him from the remote effects of an inspiration often misinterpreted by those who were its instruments—have been unable to grasp any idea of his genius or character as a whole. His image was invariably coloured, and too often distorted by the medium through which it was dimly seen, and he has been variously regarded by the men of his day as patriot or rebel, statesman or conspirator, philosopher or dreamer. The few who knew him knew that he was something far above any or all of these; but since the endeavour to pourtray a genius at once so many-sided and unique, would require the labour of a life, my aim in these pages will simply be, to set before you a true though faint image of the *heart* of the man. I cannot relate to you all that he achieved for his country and for humanity, but I may make clear to you the motives and convictions which determined his course. From the writings herewith published, you will learn something of the faith which was to him as a pillar of fire, leading for ever onwards, and which he followed with unresting foot throughout the strange and gloomy paths of his "sad, unallied existence." "He only is a believer who lives by his belief:" I shall show you in these pages that Mazzini's whole existence was a living religion; knowing that such of you as seriously adopt that religion, will assuredly be strengthened to follow in his footsteps from afar.

Joseph Mazzini was born in the Strada Lomellini,

Genoa, on the 22d June 1805. His father, Giacomo Mazzini, was a distinguished physician and professor of anatomy in that town. His mother, Maria Mazzini (born Drago), was a native of Chiaveri. She was a woman of great personal beauty, quick and vigorous intellect, and strong and deep affections. Fondly attached to all her children, Joseph was her idol; and she loved her exiled son during the whole period of their long and weary separation with an intense and unselfish devotion worthy of him upon whom it was bestowed. Mazzini was an extremely fragile and delicate child—so weak, that, although well-formed, he was unable even to stand at an age when most children run alone; and he passed the first years of his life sitting upon a little chair-bed, which his father had fashioned for him, in his mother's room. He was nearly six years of age before he could walk firmly, and it was by slow degrees that he acquired sufficient strength to pass the boundaries of the little garden in front of his father's house. The first occasion upon which his mother ventured to allow him to accompany her some distance beyond its walls was rendered memorable to her by an incident which she always related with much pleasure. They had gone but a short distance, when the child suddenly stood still, gazing intently upon an old beggar seated upon the steps of a church. So transfixed stood the boy, that his mother, fearing he was frightened at the venerable white beard and picturesque rags and staff of the old man, stooped down to carry the child away; but he broke from her, and, running impetuously forward, threw his arms round the poor man's neck, kissing him again and again, and crying out to her, "Give him something, mother; give him something." The old man was affected even to

tears; he tenderly returned the child's caresses, and, addressing Signora Mazzini in pure [illegible] man accents,* said: "*Love him well, lady; he is one who will love the people.*"

The exile's mother was never tired of repeating this "symbolical anecdote," as she truly termed it; and the tears that stood in her eyes when she told it to the present writer, nearly forty years after the [illegible] showed how deeply its holy symbolism had [illegible] heart. She added that the sympathy and te[illegible] which the boy was moved by the sight of p[illegible] suffering were frequently afterwards evinced [illegible] and impetuous caresses bestowed upon outc[illegible] whom others turned away with indifference or [illegible] and that even before that time, when, fro[illegible] always confined to one room, he had never *seen* m[illegible] when a servant entered with a tale of distress told by some poor beggar at the outer door, if she ventured to say that she had nothing to give, and order that the applicant should be sent away unrelieved, the child would burst into a passion of tears, and tear his long black hair, crying: "No! no! mother, no! give something; give something to the poor man;" nor would he ever be quieted until she had yielded to his entreaties, and sent out either money or bread and wine, when he would kiss her hands or her gown, and laugh with delight, while the tears were still running down his pale cheeks.

As a little child, his disposition was unusually thoughtful and serious: playthings and the ordinary amusements of childhood appeared to have no charms for him. His father, observing the unusual development of his intellect and the apparent fragility of his constitution, would

* The Genoese of that day invariably spoke in dialect.

not allow him to be taught to read; yet before he was four years old, his mother discovered that he could already read fluently, having profited unobserved by what he overheard of the lessons given to his sisters in an adjoining room; and whenever, on the occasion of any family festival or anniversary, she asked him what present he would like, he invariably answered, "A book." She loved to entreat all who came near him to tell him their love, laughing almost convulsively at such as were unselfish, listening with rapt attention to such as were bestowed. He, unlike other children, would never endure to hear the same story twice. Always patient and unable to bear the weary confinement of his early years, alone, has been described by one who saw him when five years of age, seated upon his little bed, gravely poring over a map—the bed itself, and even the floor around, strewed with his books—as looking like a philosopher in Lilliput. He was seen thus by a cousin of his mother's, a colonel of artillery, during a visit he paid to Genoa at that time, and the deep impression left upon his mind by the strange and gifted child is shown by a letter written by him two years later (in 1812) to Signora Mazzini, in answer to a request from her that he would advise her as to the course of study to be pursued by her little son. The old colonel must himself have been a superior man, or he could not have foreseen so accurately the intellectual future of a child not six years of age. In his remarkable letter, he says: "Believe me, Signora Cousin, that dear child is a star of the first magnitude, kindled with genuine light, and one day to be admired by the whole of enlightened Europe. All men should therefore regard him as something belonging to them; and it is for the interest of all men that the extraordinary gifts lavished upon him by nature should be turned to the

best account. The great geniuses that, at different epochs, arise to become the glory of their century, generally thus give evidence of their great powers even in early infancy; and thus is made manifest our duty of making every conceivable sacrifice for our child's education." The worthy colonel then proceeds to particularise the branches of study he considered most calculated to develop the boy's "astonishing and tenacious memory, and unlimited capacity for acquiring knowledge," and adds, "he has such an innate, invincible desire for study, that he may safely pass, without interval, from one subject to another, without the smallest danger of confusing or overburdening his intellect." The last passage in the colonel's letter is so prophetic as to be very noteworthy. After counselling his cousin to confine her child's studies to the acquisition of pure knowledge and learning, and to avoid giving him books containing theories, systems, or opinions, he concludes by saying: "A genius such as his will easily select for itself, or *create* these, in its own good time."

The letter, the prophecies of which have been so singularly fulfilled, bears date, "Pavia, Aug. 28, 1812."

Mazzini's first tutor was a worthy old priest, who professedly taught him everything, but in fact taught him little else than Latin. His passion for reading, however, and the facility with which he acquired modern languages, and mastered the contents of every book he could lay his hands on, supplied the place of many masters. He has frequently spoken of the avidity with which, while a mere lad, he devoured the philosophical and political writers of the period of the French Revolution, which he had discovered hidden away behind the

medical books in his father's library. At the age of thirteen he was sent to the University of Genoa. A fellow-student thus writes his recollections of him there:—

"Jose[illegible] was much distinguished at the university by his acute[illegible] in philosophical discussion, and much loved and r[illegible]ected by his fellow-students for his good qualities of [illegible]d and heart. He was, however, frequently subject[illegible]d to great annoyance from the professors, owing to his being unwilling or unable to conform to the innumerable formalities and ceremonies, the performance of which it was the fashion to exact from students in those days. Besides going through the regular course of study, he took private lessons in mathematics, music, English, and fencing; but he acquired everything without effort, and his health, which had been so delicate in childhood, far from being injured by the amount of intellectual exertion he went through, appeared to be strengthened and improved by the rapidity of his mental growth.

"His ascendancy and influence over his companions were truly astonishing; all appreciated the gentleness of his nature, the loyalty and generosity of his character, and the indomitable love of justice which always caused him at once to interfere to protect any of his companions whom he saw ill-treated, whether by students or professors. Simple and economical in his own habits, he always found means generously to assist the wants of those around him; indeed, he carried this disposition to excess; for, not content with giving away his books, money, &c., he constantly bestowed even his clothes upon the needy among his fellow-students. In dress he was scrupulously simple; and from a child he insisted

on dressing entirely in black," a habit which he never altered in after life."

Another college friend, who gives a similar description of the sweetness of Mazzini's disposition and the independence of his character, says:—"He could never be made to observe the foolish forms and ceremonies prescribed to the students in those days, from an instinctive abhorrence of all merely arbitrary rule. Neither threats, nor the various modes of persecution adopted towards him by the professors, could induce him to comply with these childish observances, and finally the professors themselves had to give way, and respecting his moral character and his great talents, feign to be unconscious of his deficiencies in these respects. Joseph studied anatomy and medicine for a time, with the idea of following his father's profession; and indeed, he had made such progress that he used to write his father's anatomical lectures for him; but he renounced the career of medicine from the impossibility in which he found himself of attending dissection without overpowering sickness and disgust, and applied himself to the study of the law. All who were at the university with him remember how loving, charitable, and gentle he was; all loved him, and his house was the rendezvous of the best and most intellectual students of the college."

* In the rare autobiographical notes which adorn the edition of his Life and Works, published by Messrs Smith and Elder, Mazzini alludes to this habit, which began at a very early age, when the idea that the Italians might free their country from foreign rule, if all of them would unite to do their duty, had first taken possession of his mind. He says:—"My spirit was crushed by the impossibility I then felt of even conceiving by what means to reduce it to action . . . . . in the midst of the noisy, tumultuous life of the scholars around me, I was sombre and absorbed, and appeared like one suddenly grown old. I childishly determined to dress always in black, fancying myself in mourning for my country. . . . . Matters went so far that my poor mother became terrified lest I should commit suicide."

The natural tendency of Mazzini's mind was towards literature, and when he was thirteen years of age, some of his compositions attracted the attention of a literary association at Savona, the members of which elected him a member of their body, without suspecting they were electing one in years little more than a child. His first really important literary production, however, was an essay "Upon a European Literature," written many years later, and containing the germs of those convictions and ideas which were afterwards to make of the author the apostle of Italian Unity and prophet of the destined alliance of the peoples of Europe. In the *Autobiographical Notes* before alluded to, he speaks of his renunciation of the literary career as "his first great sacrifice," and says: "A thousand visions of historical dramas and romances floated before my mental eye—artistic images that caressed my spirit, as visions of gentle maidens soothe the soul of the lonely-hearted. The natural bias of my mind was very different from that which has been forced upon me by the times in which I have lived, and the shame of our degradation."

It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to trace the first dawn of the patriotic idea in a youth of such early intensity of feeling. Although the enslavement and degradation of his country must have caused him many a previous thrill of shame and anguish, he himself dated back his first conscious and definite aspiration towards a nobler future for Italy, to the ideas awakened by the execution in Genoa of two revolutionists,* and by seeing alms collected in the streets of his native town in aid of the exiles banished after the insurrection of 1821.

After five years passed at the University, Mazzini, having taken his degree, was admitted to practise as an

* Garelli and Laneri.

advocate. This was esteemed a great day by his parents, who looked forward to a successful and prosperous legal career for their gifted son; he was himself gloomy and depressed by the sense that he must disappoint their hopes, and that he should never follow the law as a profession, having already formed the inward resolution to devote his life to the regeneration of his country.

The first two years of a young advocate's life in Italy, in those days, were spent in the *Ufficio dei Poveri*, where they pleaded gratis the causes of the poor. During the short time that Mazzini performed that office, he distinguished himself by the patient attention he gave to the often wearisome details of this duty; the zeal with which he entered into the cases of his poor clients; his logical accuracy, quick and ready wit, and extraordinary facility of language and illustration. From his youthful and delicate appearance, he was called *L'Avvocatino*,* and his reputation for success as well as energy and kindness was so great, that the first hope and endeavour of every poor man having a cause to be pleaded in Genoa was, to secure the services of the gentle Avocatino.

Mazzini had already joined the secret association called the *Carbonari*, having been affiliated by a spy who afterwards betrayed him. Although so young, he saw nothing but the comic in the old-fashioned bowl-and-dagger ceremonies of affiliation, and, far from being awe-struck or impressed, had great difficulty to keep his countenance on the occasion, and when the little scene was over, he "reflected with surprise and distrust that the oath which had been administered to him was a mere formula of obedience, containing nothing as to the

* Literally, the Little Advocate.

aim to be reached . . . it was war to the Government, nothing more." While studying the causes of the failure of the revolutions of 1820-21, he had learned much of Carbonarism, and did not admire the symbolism, the mysteries, nor the want of all political faith or belief which he discovered in the institution, but he was unable at that time to found an association of his own; he knew the importance of organization, and in the Carbonari he found "men who, though inferior to the idea they represented," (the idea of Italian independence from foreign rule), "were yet earnestly bent on reducing their thought to action, their belief into works." Here were men who, "defying alike excommunication and capital punishment, had the persistent energy ever to persevere, and to weave a fresh web each time the old one was broken." And this," Mazzini adds, "was enough to induce me to join my name and my labours to theirs. And now that my hair is grey, I still believe that next to the capacity of rightly leading, the greatest merit consists in knowing how and when to follow. I speak, of course, of following those who lead towards good. Those young men—too numerous in Italy as elsewhere—who hold themselves aloof from all collective association or organized party, out of respect for their own *individuality*, are generally the first to succumb, and that in the most servile manner, to any strongly organized, governing *power*." How terrible a commentary on these words is furnished by the recent history of France!

The subscriptions required from each member to the funds of the association were a heavy tax upon Mazzini's slender purse, yet he "thought it a good thing," and his remarks upon this subject are well worth attention in the present day, when too many reforms are prevented or

needlessly delayed, by the selfish parsimony of those who nevertheless profess to be convinced of their justice. He says, "It is a great sin to collect money for any bad purpose; but it is a still greater sin to recoil from pecuniary sacrifice when the probabilities are in favour of thereby aiding a good cause. One of the saddest signs of the all-pervading and deep-rooted egotism of the present day is the fact that men will argue and discuss about a franc, while they willingly throw away large sums to procure comforts or enjoyments—for the most part rather imaginary than real,—that men who should be ready to coin their very blood to create a country, and found true liberty, will bewail the impossibility of frequent sacrifice, and peril life, honour, the dignity of their own souls, and the souls of their brother men, rather than unloosen the strings of their purse."

But Mazzini's chief reason for dissatisfaction with the Carbonari was the fact that they did not attempt to rouse the Italian people to win their freedom for themselves; but founded their hope of achieving that national independence which is the necessary first step towards political liberty, upon the aid of France, where the struggle between the opposition in the Assembly and the Government of Charles X., which led to the Revolution of 1830, was then at its height, and hoped all things from such men as Guizot, Berthe, Lafayette, &c. Mazzini was, even in those days, fully aware that no nation either deserves freedom, or can long retain it, which dares not win it for itself.

Shortly after the French revolution of June 1830, Mazzini, having been entrusted with some trifling mission by the chiefs of the Carbonari, was impressed by a presentiment of betrayal, and before undertaking his journey, arranged a method of secret correspondence with

his political friends through the medium of letters to his mother, which should apparently treat merely of domestic matters. This foresight proved useful, for he was shortly afterwards arrested by the police of the King of Piedmont and Sardinia. Any Italian convicted of the crime of loving his country, was in as much danger in the Piedmontese vice-royalty, as in the provinces directly under Austrian rule. Although at the moment of his arrest, which occurred as he was leaving his house, he had "matter enough for three condemnations" upon him, he succeeded, with that coolness in danger which distinguished him through life, in getting rid of everything which could endanger others. He was imprisoned in the fortress of Savona on the western Riviera. His father hastened to the governor of Genoa to ask of what crime his son was accused, and received for answer that "he was a young man of talent, very fond of solitary walks by night, and habitually silent as to the subject of his meditations, and that *the government was not fond of young men of talent the subject of whose musings was unknown to it.*" Monarchical and aristocratic governments, being founded upon the principle of the inequality of God's children, are far-seeing and wise in their generation when they dread the result of the musings of young men of talent.

Mazzini's cell was at the top of the fortress of Savona. "It looked," he says, "upon the sea, which was a comfort to me. The sea and sky — two symbols of the infinite, and, except the Alps, the sublimest things in nature—were before me whenever I approached my little grated window. The earth beneath was invisible to me, but when the wind

blew in my direction, I could hear the voices of the fishermen." *

Mazzini's prison companion was a greenfinch, to which he was extremely attached, and, indeed, his fondness for all dumb animals, and especially for birds, was a life-long characteristic. Whenever, during his wandering life, he remained for a few months stationary in any place, he was certain soon to have birds about him, which were allowed liberty to fly about his room and pull and peck at his books and papers at their pleasure. During the first month of his imprisonment, he was allowed no books; but he afterwards succeeded in obtaining a Bible, a Tacitus, and a Byron.

By means of the method of secret correspondence of which I have spoken, he learned from his friends that his arrest had struck terror among the Carbonari, and after "vainly endeavouring to extract a spark of true life from them," he "gradually became convinced that instead of wasting time and energy in the attempt to galvanise a corpse," he must address himself to the living, and found "a new revolutionary edifice upon a new basis."

From this imprisonment we may date Mazzini's religious and republican apostolate; for it was here that he conceived the plan of that association of "YOUNG ITALY," which, as time will yet show, has laid deep in the soil of Italy the foundation stones of a new edifice of true unity and independence, destined to replace

* The above words might stand for a description of his cell in the Fortress of Gaëta, during his last imprisonment (1870), by the grandson of the king under whose reign occurred the first. The windows at Gaëta were not, however, grated. They were loop-holes, pierced through walls of enormous thickness, and so narrow, that even had the cell been near the ground instead of at the top of the fortress, all escape through them would have been impossible.

the unshapely fabric now surmounted by the Savoyard crown. The real liberator of his nation was doomed never to behold the promised land of Italian Republican Unity, which his regenerated and repentant countrymen are certain to reach. Then, and then only, will they recognise the genius and worthily reverence the name of the prophet and teacher who led them within sight of their inheritance.

Imprisoned, but surrounded by the symbols of the infinite, this young man meditated deeply upon the religious and moral principles which were to serve as the foundations of the new Association, intended to supplant the Carbonarism he had seen to be inefficient, and inferior to his exalted aim. The aim of "YOUNG ITALY" would be, not merely independence from the foreign rule which held the country enslaved, but from the domestic tyrants by whom she was divided into six distinct, and, at times, antagonistic states, as well as from the Papal despotism which, by enclosing the mind of the nation within the gloomy and darkened aisles of a degrading superstition, rendered all moral and mental progress impossible. He did not underrate the dangers and difficulties of the enterprise, but having no thought of self in the matter, was in no way appalled by them.

He also pondered long over the organization of the Association; the individuals to be selected to aid in its creation, and the possibility of linking its operation and action with those of the revolutionary elements already existing in other European countries. Secresy was extremely repugnant to his frank and loyal nature, but secresy with regard to the *operations* of a society in direct antagonism to the existing powers, was a necessity. He decided, however, that the aim and purpose

of YOUNG ITALY should be public. No oath of obedience to unknown chiefs or unknown designs should—as in the case of Carbonarism—be exacted from its members. Every man who joined the Association should do so with a clear and distinct understanding that he thereby bound himself to dare all things and to suffer all things to secure, first, the independence of his native land; and secondly, her unity under a Republican form of government; and to abjure all princely or diplomatic aid, whether native or foreign. It would be the business of the members of the Association to rouse the Italian people to a sense of their duty to achieve the rights of independence and self-government by means of their own sacrifices and at the cost of their own blood. Mazzini had no faith in the privileged classes; his trust was in the people. He believed the whole problem to consist in appealing to the instincts and tendencies of the national Italian heart, *mute at that time*, but revealed to him both by the study of history and his own previsions of the future. His genius is splendidly evinced by the fact that he, alone in Europe at that day, intuitively perceived that the slumber of his nation was not death; and that he recognised, even then, the truth which smaller men never learn, that "all great national enterprises have ever been originated by men of the people, whose sole strength lay in that power of *faith* and of *will* which neither counts obstacles nor measures time. Men of means and influence follow after; either to support and carry on the movement created by the first, *or, as too often happens, to divert it from its original aim.*"

It was from no impulse of juvenile enthusiasm, but from deep study both of the political history and the internal social constitution of his country, that Mazzini

was led—as the greatest minds of all countries are led —to regard Unity and the Republic as the means of national regeneration, and to prefix these as the Aim of the proposed Association of *Young Italy.* And here I may again refer to what Garrison has said of Mazzini's patriotism, which, intense and devoted as it was, was invariably dominated by a humanitarian aim.

Loving Italy as never son loved mother, he was yet not influenced by any merely Italian conception, or idea of elevating the condition of the single people whom he saw thus dismembered, degraded, and oppressed; the parent-thought, the supreme justification of his every endeavour was, the conviction that Italy was providentially designed to become again a moral leader and teacher among the peoples; or, as he has himself expressed it, "to arise the *Initiatrix* of a new life, and of a new and powerful unity, to the nations of Europe."

Mazzini's religion was of the same universal and exalted character. He believed religion — the sacred aspiration of the creature towards the Creator—to be immortal and progressive, even as humanity itself is immortal and progressive, and consequently, while disregarding, as futile and transitory, the innumerable varieties of one decayed creed, each of which is miscalled religion at the present day,—he reverenced the holy and beautiful mission achieved for mankind by that creed in the past; and despised and condemned the miserable negations of those who, because they no longer find warmth in the dying embers, deny the very fire to which those embers bear witness, or "imagine they have abolished God himself, when they have but abolished an idol;" one of the many such which have been worshipped by our forefathers as His image.

Mazzini's patriotism was, in fact, a logical consequence of his religious faith. The "worship of Rome," which he has described as "a part of his being," was no narrow devotion to the metropolis of his native land; the fact that Rome alone among cities had twice given a religion to the European world, which, during one historic period, had guided and directed the peoples and had made them morally One—was regarded by him as the sign of a *special* religious mission assigned to her by God; and it was his firm faith that a new and nobler religion, combining all the truths taught to humanity by the great religions of the past, but rejecting the admixture of error and superstition by which they were defaced, and revealing to humanity "a new line of the law of God," would yet be bestowed upon the peoples by Rome. Hence the liberation of Rome from the ignoble thraldom of Catholicism and monarchy, was in his eyes no mere war of independence for a single people, but a holy crusade. He believed that a new Rome, greater than the Rome of the Emperors, holier than the Rome of the Popes—the Rome of the Italian Republican People—would again unite the nations in a vaster moral unity than any yet known; that the first hymn raised to the Almighty by the voice of the Italian republican people would "sound the chord that harmonises right and duty," and proclaim, not to individuals but to nations, what he has termed "the Word of the epoch," ASSOCIATION,—"through which liberty and equality are destined to be realized here on earth; sanctifying the earth, and rendering it what God wills it should be, a stage upon the path towards perfection; a means given to man wherewith to deserve a higher and nobler existence hereafter. . . . And when, in my earliest years, I believed that the *initiative* of the third life of Europe

would spring from the heart, the action, the enthusiasm, and the sacrifices of our people, I heard within me the grand voice of Rome sounding once again; its utterances treasured up and accepted with loving reverence by the peoples, and telling of moral unity and fraternity in a faith common to all humanity. . . . I saw Rome—in the name of God and Republican Italy—substituting a declaration of PRINCIPLES for the sterile declaration of *Rights;*—principles the logical consequences of the parent-idea—PROGRESS, and revealing to the nations a common aim and the basis of a new Religion. And I saw Europe, weary of scepticism, egotism, and anarchy, accept the new faith with acclamations." "Such," he says, "were my thoughts in my little cell at Savona;" and although on another page he sadly writes,—"The vision which brightened my first dream of country has vanished for as much as concerns my own life; even if that vision be fulfilled—as I believe it will be—I shall be in the tomb"—yet he adds, "I think the same thoughts still, on broader grounds, and with maturer logic, in the little room, no larger than that cell, wherein I write these lines.* And during life they have brought upon me the title of Utopist and madman, together with such frequent disenchantments and outrage as have often caused me—while yet some hopes of *individual* life yearned within me—to look back with longing and regret to my cell at Savona between sea and sky, and far from the contact of men."

Such were his thoughts forty years later in his cell at Gaëta, wherein, a few hours before his liberation, he declared to the present writer that on his journey back to England he would not pass through Rome. "I

* 1861 (England).

cannot," he said, "look upon Rome profaned by monarchy."

May the Italians of the coming generation show themselves men enough to wipe out the shame of these words.

CHAPTER II.

EXILE: "YOUNG ITALY." 1831 TO 1836.

AFTER six months' imprisonment Mazzini was banished and went to France. This was the commencement of what he has himself described as "the hell of exile—that lingering, bitter, agonising death, which none can *know* but the exile himself; that consumption of the soul which has but *one* hope to console it." Among the other exiles with whom he became acquainted at that time he "did not find a single man who dreamed of the possibility, or even desirability, of the unity of Italy." They were, moreover, under the delusion that France was destined to give liberty to Europe, and he was distressed to discover that their notion of political science—like that of the governments they had endeavoured to overthrow—was "the science of diplomatic calculation, and management of opportune compromises, in which neither belief nor morality had any part." Among the Italians in Lyons, however, he "found a spark of true life." They were plotting an armed invasion of Savoy, then a portion of the Sardinian kingdom, and were encouraged by Louis Philippe, who had not yet been recognized by the despotic monarchs, and was seeking to obtain their recognition by frightening them, and rendering it a necessity. That aim once obtained, he abandoned both the Italian and Spanish patriots to their fate, and issued a severe proclamation desiring the exiles to disband, and threatening to punish

with the utmost rigour of the criminal law, any persons who should venture to compromise France with friendly powers by violating their frontiers. "It was," says Mazzini, "the third royal betrayal I had seen enacted under my own eyes in Italian matters. The first was the shameful flight of the Carbonaro conspirator-Prince, Charles Albert, to the camp of the enemy. The second was that of the Duke of Modena, who, after encouraging and protecting *the insurrection organized in his name* by poor Ciro Menotti, attacked and seized him in the very moment of the rising, and dragged him along with him in his flight to Mantua, to hang him as soon as Austria furnished him with the means of returning to his dukedom."

The "refugee hunt" now began; and Mazzini proceeded to Corsica, intending to join a little band of two or three thousand Corsicans, who were already armed and organized for the purpose of sailing to Italy in aid of the insurrection which had broken out in Bologna, in the states of the Popes. The Provisional Government of Bologna, however, shrinking from war and trusting only in diplomacy, delayed furnishing them with ships or supplies; the Austrians shortly afterwards intervened, and as all hope of action was for the time at an end, Mazzini returned to Marseilles, and resumed his design of founding the Association of YOUNG ITALY.

Charles Albert, King of Piedmont and Sardinia, ascended the throne in that year (1831). As prince he had conspired, or feigned to conspire, for the deliverance of Italy in 1821, but had saved himself in the hour of danger by betraying his fellow-conspirators. Nevertheless there were many in Italy who were filled with hope at the time of his accession, that as king he might redeem the fair promises he had made as prince.

Mazzini did not share these hopes. Writing of that period, in 1861, he says: "I did not then, and do not now, believe that the salvation of Italy can ever be accomplished by monarchy; that is to say, the salvation of Italy such as I understand it, and as we all understood it a few years since—an Italy, one, free, and powerful; independent of all foreign supremacy, and morally worthy of her great mission." Nevertheless, he addressed an admirable letter to the king, "publicly declaring to him all that his own heart should have taught him of his duty towards Italy," his purpose being but "to prove to his countrymen the king's absolute lack of those qualities which alone could have rendered the fulfilment of that duty possible."

This letter was published in Marseilles; clandestine reprints of it were soon made, and by this means it was quickly spread over Italy. Mazzini tells us that the King received a copy and read it; and that, shortly afterwards, a circular was despatched by the Government to the authorities at all the frontiers, containing a personal description of the writer, with instructions that, should he attempt to return to Italy, he should be instantly imprisoned. But the letter was received with favour by his countrymen; and this Mazzini accepted as a proof that by speaking openly of the unity of Italy he had awakened an echo in their hearts, and it was "his first encouragement to dare."

Finding Marseilles a convenient place for carrying on his secret correspondence, he determined to remain there at all risks, leading, he says, "the life I have led for twenty years out of thirty,* a life of voluntary imprisonment within the four walls of one little room."

Here it was that he founded the Association of YOUNG

* Written in 1861.

ITALY, and issued a little journal bearing the same name. The members of the Association swore to consecrate their lives to the work of uniting their dismembered country into "one free, independent, republican nation," able to hold her own against foreign usurpation. They swore to unite her, "because, without unity there is no real strength—and Italy, surrounded by powerful, united, and jealous nations, needed strength before all things; because federalism, by reducing her to the political impotency of Switzerland, would necessarily place her under the influence of one of the neighbouring nations, and re-kindle those rivalries between state and state which had been so injurious to her in the past; and because lasting liberty can only be achieved or maintained in Europe by strong and compact nations equally balanced in power, and therefore not liable to be driven to the necessity of seeking a protecting alliance by guilty concessions, or to be led astray by the hope of assistance in territorial questions to the point of seeking to ally their own liberty with despotism."

Republicanism was with Mazzini no merely political doctrine: it was a *faith*—the logical and necessary consequence of his religious faith in the oneness of humanity. The foresight of genius enabled him to perceive, even at that day, what the teaching of events has since made clear to lesser minds, the fact that "the whole tendency of the progressive movement taking place throughout Europe is providentially directed towards the gradual realization of the republican principle." He and his followers swore to educate the Italian people in that principle:

"Because every nation is destined by the law of God and humanity to form a free and equal community of

brothers, and the republican is the only form of government that ensures this future:

"Because all true sovereignty resides essentially in the nation, the sole progressive and continuous interpreter of the moral law:

"Because whatever be the form of privilege that constitutes the apex of the social edifice, its tendency is always to spread among the other classes, and by undermining the equality of the citizens, to endanger the liberty of the country:

"Because, so soon as the sovereignty is recognised as existing, not in the *whole* body, but in several distinct powers, the path to usurpation is laid open, *and the struggle for supremacy between these powers is inevitable;* distrust and organized hostility take the place of harmony, which is society's law of life:

"Because, as the monarchical element is incapable of sustaining itself alone by the side of the popular element, it necessarily involves the existence of the intermediate element of an *aristocracy—the source of inequality and corruption to the whole nation:*

"Because both history and the nature of things teach us that elective monarchy tends to generate anarchy; and hereditary monarchy tends to generate despotism:

"Because when monarchy is not—as it was in the middle ages—based upon the belief—now extinct—in *right divine,* it becomes too weak to be a bond of unity and authority in the state:

"Because monarchy, by logical necessity, draws along with it all the obligations of that monarchical system in Europe of which it is a part—*trust in and respect for diplomacy,* and *the repression of the popular element.*"

Being thus opposed, not merely to despotic monarchy, but to the monarchical idea itself, the modern com-

promise of constitutional monarchy necessarily appeared to him to be "a concession involving its own condemnation," and he would answer the plea commonly raised to him by English apologists of the system—*the people are not yet ripe for a republic*—by reminding them that a system founded on privilege is ill-calculated to teach men equality; that republican simplicity is ill-learnt in courts; that secret diplomacy will never teach statesmen republican sincerity; that, in short, republican scholars are not trained in monarchical schools.

The method by which Mazzini intended YOUNG ITALY to strive towards the unity and independence of Italy, was "insurrection—by means of guerilla bands—the true method of warfare for all nations desirous of emancipating themselves from a foreign yoke." The method by which YOUNG ITALY was to strive towards the realization of its republican programme was education. Mazzini held that "by preaching exclusively that which it believes to be the truth, the Association performs a work of duty, not of usurpation;" but he never forgot that the first principle of republicanism—reverence for the national will—forbade every attempt to impose any political theory upon the nation. He declared that "By inculcating before the hour of action by what steps the Italians must achieve their aim; by raising its" (republican) "flag in the sight of Italy, and calling upon all those who believe it to be the flag of national regeneration, to organize themselves beneath its folds, *the Association does not seek to substitute that flag for the banner of the nation.* When once the nation herself shall be free and able to exercise that right of sovereignty which is hers alone, she will raise her own banner and make known her revered and unchallenged will as to the principle and the fundamental law of her existence."

"The motto of the Association, '*Ora e sempre,*'* indicated," says Mazzini, "the constancy indispensable for our enterprise." Its symbol was a sprig of cypress, in memory of those who had died for the liberty of Italy. The oath taken by the members of the Association was as follows:—

"In the name of God and of Italy;

"In the name of all the martyrs of the holy Italian cause who have fallen beneath foreign and domestic tyranny;

"By the duties which bind me to the land wherein God has placed me, and to the brothers whom God has given me;

"By the love—innate in all men—I bear to the country that gave my mother birth, and will be the home of my children;

"By the hatred—innate in all men—I bear to evil, injustice, usurpation, and arbitrary rule;

"By the blush that rises to my brow when I stand before the citizens of other lands, to know that I have no rights of citizenship, no country, and no national flag;

"By the aspiration that thrills my soul towards that liberty for which it was created, and is impotent to exert; towards the good it was created to strive after, and is impotent to achieve in the silence and isolation of slavery;

"By the memory of our former greatness, and the sense of our present degradation;

"By the tears of Italian mothers for their sons dead on the scaffold, in prison, or in exile;

"By the sufferings of the millions,

"I,—A. B., believing in the mission intrusted by God to Italy, and the duty of every Italian to strive

* *Now and for ever.*

to attempt its fulfilment; convinced that where God has ordained that a nation shall be, He has given the requisite power to create it; that *the people are the depositaries of that power*; and that *in its right direction by the people and for the people* lies the secret of victory; convinced that virtue consists in action and sacrifice, and strength in union and constancy of purpose, —give my name to YOUNG ITALY, an association of men holding the same faith, and swear:—

"To dedicate myself wholly and for ever to the endeavour with them to constitute Italy one, free, independent, republican nation; to promote by every means in my power—whether by written or spoken word or by action—the education of my Italian brothers towards the aim of YOUNG ITALY; towards Association, the sole means of its accomplishment, and to virtue, which alone can render the conquest lasting; to abstain from enrolling myself in any other association from this time forth; to obey all the instructions—in conformity with the spirit of YOUNG ITALY—given to me by those who represent with me the union of my Italian brothers; to keep the secret of these instructions even at the cost of my life; and to assist my brothers of the Association both by action and counsel—

"NOW AND FOR EVER.

"This do I swear, invoking upon my head the wrath of God, the abhorrence of man, and the infamy of the perjurer if I ever betray the whole or a part of this my oath."

Mazzini tells us that he was himself the first to take the oath, and he adds that many of those who took it then or since, were, at the time of his writing (1861) courtiers, busy members of *Moderate** Societies, timid

* The Monarchical Party in Italy thought proper to call themselves *Moderates*.

servants of the Bonapartist policy, and persecutors and calumniators of their former brethren. "They may," he says, "hate me, as one who recalls to them the faith they swore to, and betrayed, but they cannot quote a single fact showing that I have been false to my oath. I believe in the sacredness of those principles, and in their future triumph now, as I did then. I have lived, I live, and I shall die a republican, bearing witness to my faith to the last. Should they attempt to exculpate themselves by asserting that I, too, have striven and do strive to realize UNITY, even under a monarchical flag, I have only to refer them to those lines in the statutes of YOUNG ITALY, which declared that *the Association did not seek to substitute its own flag for the banner of the nation*, and that when *the nation herself should be free she would proclaim her revered and unchallenged will.*" And, alluding to the monarchical *furore* which at that time afflicted Italy, he adds:

"The people of Italy are led astray by a delusion at the present day. . . . . Not so I. I bow my head sorrowfully to the national will, but monarchy will never number me among its servants or followers. The future will declare whether my faith is founded on truth or not."

In the journal called *Young Italy*, Mazzini published much of the religious and political philosophy elaborated in his own mind during his imprisonment. He preached insurrection against all foreign rule, in the name of Italian unity and independence; and the republic, in the name of human responsibility. Copies of this journal were secretly conveyed into safe keeping in two or three of the nearest coast towns of Italy, where they were passed from hand to hand by numbers who risked their lives to read, and quickly reproduced and disseminated throughout the whole of the Peninsula by means of the

clandestine press. The effect was immense—"from student to student, from youth to youth, the confraternity extended with unexpected rapidity," and the same hands that smuggled the paper into Italy brought back such a multitude of names and adhesions as to astonish the little band of fellow exiles who had undertaken with him the labour and the risk of the publication. To him the favour with which his ideas were received was an encouraging confirmation of his faith in the instincts of the Italian people.

The sensation produced by his writings was probably the more profound, because the history of the insurrectionary movements which had recently taken place in the Centre of Italy afforded a striking illustration of the justice of his views. The Roman States revolted against the tyranny of the Pope in that year: Parma against the Austrian Grand Duchess, and Modena against the Duke. These insurrections, although nearly simultaneous, were not the result of any concerted plan; yet, between the 2d and 25th of February 1831, nearly two millions and a half of Italians had thus freed themselves from the yoke of the viceroys of Austria and of the Pope, and were in a condition to carry on not merely defensive but offensive war for the emancipation of their fellow-countrymen.

To the credit of the popular instinct in favour of unity it may be observed, that the youth of Bologna had endeavoured to enter Tuscany, in order to assist their Tuscan fellow-countrymen to rise against the Austrian Grand Duke; the people of Modena and Reggio had clamoured to push on to the deliverance of Massa, and the National Guards had demanded to be led against the tyrant of Naples. But the various Provisional Governments sprung out of the insurrection.

contrived to convert a revolution essentially national in impulse and in aim, into separate and merely provincial movements. As it would have been impossible for the Centre to maintain its freedom, while the neighbouring provinces of Italy were ruled by hostile governments, it was evident that policy, as well as duty, pointed out the importance of enlarging the area of the revolution, as the one condition of permanent success. War with Austria, the common foe, was inevitable, and every effort should have been directed towards the energetic prosecution of war; but the incapable Provisional Governments of the insurgent states, assured the populations that their only chance of salvation lay in the preservation of peace with the rulers of the neighbouring princedoms. Instead of profitting by the sympathy and excitement produced by the insurrection among their countrymen, they blindly endeavoured to win the favour of kings, and prostrated the movement at the feet of diplomacy.

Precisely when it was necessary to rouse others to action by acting themselves, and to inspire faith by showing faith, their every act displayed hesitation and weakness. Moreover, they trusted to the fair promises of France. The French ambassador at Naples had promised them that France would support them, "provided their new government should recognize the order of things generally adopted by Europe;" the President of the French Chamber had declared, "the new principle proclaimed by France is that of allowing the development of liberty wheresoever it may spontaneously appear;" and the Minister of Foreign Affairs had added, "the principle consecrated by us, and *which we intend to see respected,* assures liberty and independence to all." They forgot, however, that in the volcanic condition of Europe at that time, any war between France

and Austria must have led to a general war between the principle of kingly authority and that of progress and national sovereignty; and that, in such a war, Louis Philippe, so recently and as yet so insecurely seated on his throne, would have run the risk of losing everything, and being overwhelmed by the popular movement. Peace was necessary to the new monarch's own safety; and it was madness to believe that he, for the sake of carrying out the principle of non-intervention in favour of a foreign people, would interfere to prevent Austria from re-establishing the rule of her vassal princes in Italy. Equally insane was the idea that Austria—herself the usurper of the northern provinces—would allow the establishment of a national government in the vicinity of her own possessions.

However, the provisional governments of the insurgent provinces chose to adopt the hypothesis that Austria would not invade, that she would allow the insurrection time enough to implant itself firmly in the heart of Italy, and they decided, therefore, that the whole policy of the revolution ought to consist in avoiding giving any just ground for invasion. Not a step was taken to assert the sovereignty and right of the nation, none to call the people to arms, none to organize the elections, none to incite or encourage the neighbouring provinces of Italy to rise.

Fear was visible in their every decree. The Provincial Governments of Parma and Modena declared that the people had been placed in the necessity of forming a new Government by the fact of the princes having abandoned their states without establishing any. The Government of Bologna stated that it had been formed in consequence of the announcement of the Pope's legate that he intended to renounce his administration, and in

order to prevent anarchy. At Parma the Government offered the leadership of the National Guard to a man named Fedeli, and on his refusal to accept it without the permission of the dethroned Grand Duchess, allowed him to request that permission, and was repaid for its folly by his starting a conspiracy in her favour.

During the ferment excited in Naples, Piedmont, and the rest of Italy by the insurrection of the Centre, the Government of Bologna proclaimed their intention not to interrupt friendly relations with the foreign rulers of those states, nor to permit the smallest violation of their territories, "hoping that, in return, no intervention to their disadvantage would take place, as they themselves had no intention of being drawn into action, unless in self-defence."

Commenting on this act, by which the Centre separated her cause from that of the rest of Italy, Mazzini says,—"This unlimited confidence in everything that bears the outward semblance of calculation and tactics, and this constant distrust of enthusiasm, energy, and simultaneous action—three things which sum up the whole science of revolution—was then, as it is now,* the mortal disease of Italy. We wait, study, and follow circumstances; we neither seek to dominate nor create them, and we honour with the name of *prudence*, that which is, in fact, mere mediocrity of intellect."

Weakness and incapacity having thus prepared the way for her success, Austria invaded Parma, Modena, and Reggio first, and shortly afterwards occupied Ferrara and Ancona. Louis Philippe did not even deign an answer to the appeal made to him by the Provisional Government of Bologna, and continued to

* Written in 1861.

maintain a friendly correspondence with the Papal Court. The "Legitimate Masters" of Italy were restored to their divine rights, and replaced upon thrones newly cemented with the blood of their worthiest subjects.

"It was from studying the ill-fated movements of 1820-21 and 1831," Mazzini says, "that I learned what errors it would be necessary to avoid in future. The greater number of Italians derived from these insurrections only a lesson of profound discouragement. To me they simply brought the conviction that success was a problem of direction, nothing more . . . The error lay in entrusting the government of the insurrection to those who had no share in making it.

"The people and the youth of Italy have always yielded the reins of direction to the first man claiming the right to hold them with any show of authority. . . . The preliminary conspiracy and the revolution have always been represented by two distinct classes of men. The first were thrust aside as soon as all obstacles were overthrown, and the second then entered the arena the day after, to direct the development of an idea not their own, a design they had not matured, the elements and difficulties of which they had never studied, and in the enthusiasm and sacrifices for which they had had no share. . . . Their liberalism was like that of the party called "Moderates" in Italy at the present day—weak and fearful, capable of a timid legal opposition on points of detail, but never going back to first principles. . . . They surrounded themselves with "descendants of the old families, professors, advocates with many clients, &c., but all of them men disinherited alike of the enthusiasm, energy, or intellect necessary to achieve revolutions."

"Our young men, trustful and inexperienced, gave way. They forgot the immense difference between the requirements of a free and of an enslaved people, and the improbability that the same men who had represented the individual or municipal interests of the one, should be fitted to represent the political and national interests of the other."

Such were some of the reflections which induced Mazzini to found the Association destined to produce so great an effect upon the future of Italy. Strengthened and encouraged by the reception given to his little journal by the Italians, he and the few young men who laboured with him, and who, so long as they were under his immediate influence, were animated by his spirit, worked on, he says, "alone, without any office, without subalterns, immersed in labour the whole of the day and the greater part of the night, writing articles and letters, seeing travellers, affiliating the Italian sailors, folding our printed articles, tying up bundles, alternating between intellectual labour and the routine of working men. We lived together, true equals and brothers; brothers in one sole hope and ideal; loved and admired for our tenacity of purpose and industry by foreign republicans. Very often—for we had only our own little funds wherewith to meet every expense—we were reduced to the extreme of poverty, but we were always cheerful, with the smile of faith in the future upon our lips.

"Those two years, from 1831 to 1833, were two years of young life of such pure and glad devotedness as I could wish the coming generation to know. We were assailed by enemies sufficiently determined, and underwent many dangers. . . . . But it was a warfare waged against us by known and avowed foes. The miserable

petty warfare of ingratitude, suspicion, and calumny amongst our own countrymen, too often even among our own party; the unmerited desertion of former friends, nay, the desertion from our banner itself, not from conviction but from weakness, offended vanity or worse, by nearly the whole of the generation that had sworn fidelity to it with us, had not then occurred—I will not say to wither or to deflower our souls—but to teach the few amongst us who remained firm *'the forced and desperate calm'* and the stern lesson of labour uncomforted by any individual hope, urged on by duty—cold, drear, inexorable duty alone. God save those who come after us from this."

In less than one year from the period of its formation, YOUNG ITALY became the dominant association throughout the whole of Italy. "It was," says Mazzini, "the triumph of *principles;* the bare fact that in so short a space of time, a handful of young men, themselves sprung from the people, unknown, without means . . . found themselves thus rapidly at the head of an association sufficiently powerful to concentrate against it the alarmed persecution of seven Governments, is, I think, in itself enough to show that the banner they had raised was the banner of the truth."

In spite of the precautions used by the little band of conspirators at Marseilles, and their friends in their native country, the attention of the authorities was fully aroused; large rewards were offered for the seizure of their papers, and tremendous punishments threatened all who should in any way aid their introduction into Italy. King Charles Albert, of Piedmont, issued edicts condemning those guilty even of *non-denunciation* to a fine and two years of imprisonment, *promising to the informer secrecy and half the*

fine. It was "the beginning," Mazzini says, "of the duel between him and the ignoble Governments of Italy," a duel which was destined to end only with his life.

Finding themselves unable to stop the diffusion of Mazzini's writings, the Italian Governments appealed to France to stifle the voice of the exile, and Louis Philippe, having now been recognised by the other kings and despots of Europe, and having no further reason for alarming them, endeavoured to comply with their request. Tracked from concealment to concealment by the French police, Mazzini for two years eluded the search, and when his asylum was at last discovered, a friend who bore some personal resemblance to him, substituted himself for him and was escorted to Switzerland in his stead, while he walked calmly through the whole row of police officers sent to arrest him. He then took refuge in Switzerland, where he organized the first armed attack made by the party of unity upon the party of princely sub-division in Italy,* which failed through the treachery of the military leader, General Ramorino.

The Government of Charles Albert took bloody revenge upon those conspirators in the interior who had plotted to support this expedition by insurrection, and among those imprisoned at that time was Mazzini's dearest friend, Jacopo Ruffini. The method of torture inflicted upon this young man may serve as an illustration of the atrocities committed under King Charles Albert. Ruffini's admiration and affection for Mazzini were well known, and in order to induce him to confess, a denunciation of his fellow-conspirators was put into his hands, bear-

* The movement generally known as "*the expedition of Savoy.*" For a good account of which, see (besides "Mazzini's Life and Works") the "*Histoire de dix Ans,*" by Louis Blanc.

ing the forged signature of his friend. Ruffini resisted the temptation, but he committed suicide that night in prison. Mazzini's affection towards him remained unchanged by death: eleven years later he dedicated the record of two other martyrs in the same cause, to his early friend, in a few lines of surpassing pathos and tenderness.

After this first defeat, many recommended Mazzini to retire from the unequal struggle; and the circumstances that ensued, after the ill-fated expedition of Savoy, appeared to give weight to their arguments. "A tremendous clamour of blame arose, uttered by all the worshippers of success," and the news from Italy told of nothing but imprisonments, flights, desertion, and disorganization. The Swiss Government was terrified by the threats of its despotic neighbours into persecuting the exiles in its turn; their war stores and financial resources were exhausted; the majority of them were without the necessaries of life, as well as labouring under a discouragement which was already sowing the seeds of dissolution and recrimination among them. But trials such as these, however bitter, were not of a nature to shake Mazzini. "More powerful upon me than any advice or any danger," he says, "were the exceeding grief and anxiety of my poor mother. Had it been possible for me to have yielded, I should have yielded to that." But he remembered that he had not sought liberty as an end, but as a means; as the necessary first step towards a higher aim. "We had," he says, "inscribed the words *Republican Unity* upon our banner. We sought to found a nation, to create a people. What was a defeat to men with such an aim in view? Was it not a part of our educational duty to teach our party a lesson of calm endurance in adversity?"

CHAPTER III.

"YOUNG EUROPE:" "DOUBT:" ENGLAND. 1836 TO 1848.

MAZZINI had already discovered that the fundamental vice which condemned the Italian people to impotence was no lack of desire for freedom, but a want of that constancy of purpose without which even virtue is fruitless, "a fatal want of harmony between thought and action." As the moral education of his countrymen through the press was impossible in an enslaved country, he felt that "a living apostolate" was required, "a nucleus of men capable of defying persecution, and of meeting defeat with the smile of faith in the name of a great idea; of succumbing one day, only to arise again the next; men ever ready to do battle and, in spite of time or adverse fortune, ever full of faith in the final victory." Remembering that he had set himself to found "not a sect, but a religion of patriotism," he solemnly determined to persist in spite of time or adverse fortune, and his unshaken adherence to the resolution thus made in youth during the anguish of the first failure and the first betrayal, converted a life-long martyrdom of incessant defeat, into a life-long victory.

The work of insurrection in Italy was for a time at an end; that of propaganda unavoidably retarded: Mazzini therefore determined, before persecution should again scatter the exiles from many lands then gathered together in Switzerland, to sow among them the first

seeds of that alliance of the peoples which he foresaw as inevitable in the future, and prepare the way for "the only idea he believed to have the power to resuscitate the vanquished peoples—the idea of Nationality." The *Carbonari*, like the Internationalists of our own day, had endeavoured to extend their work into all lands and admitted men of every nation into their ranks, but the error of the earlier, like that of the later association, lay in the fact that it "was a *cosmopolitan* association in the philosophical sense of the word." It recognised only the human race and individuals; when once initiated, its members ceased to be Frenchmen, Italians, or Germans, in order to become merely Carbonari, nothing more.

"If by *Cosmopolitanism*," wrote Mazzini, "we understand the brotherhood of all men, love for all men, the destruction of those hostile barriers which separate and give rise to antagonistic interests among the peoples—then are we all cosmopolitans." But he pointed out that "the true question was, how were the peoples to triumph over the league of the governments founded upon privilege? This required an organization, and every method of organization requires a determinate *stand point*, and a definite aim. Before we speak of putting a lever in motion we must not only possess a lever, but a definite object upon which to exert its power." Mazzini therefore held that in order to put the lever—the peoples—in motion for the benefit of humanity, it was necessary to secure to them the *stand point*—the Fatherland. "The *Cosmopolitans*, by practically denying themselves a country, deprived themselves of the standpoint whence to act upon humanity, and by throwing away the fulcrum, rendered the lever impotent."

He showed that those reformers who are adverse to the idea of nationality, are unconsciously prejudiced by

the shameless prostitution of the sacred word, and the tyranny and oppression practised upon the peoples in its name, in the treaties and alliances drawn up by kings and privileged families in the past. "Those kings thought only of their own interests; those treaties were drawn up, in the secrecy of cabinets, by individuals who had no true mission; the peoples had no voice in them; they were inspired by no conception of humanity. How should there be any sacredness in them? The *Fatherland* of kings was their own family, their own dynasty and race. Their *aim* was their own aggrandisement at the expense of others. Their whole doctrine might have been summed up in one proposition —*the weakening of the mass for the furtherance and security of their own individual interests.* Their treaties were merely compromises with necessity; their every peace was merely a truce; their *balance of power* an attempt to avert possible attacks, and inspired by a constant sense of hostility and distrust."

"This distrust is revealed in all the dealings of their diplomacy. It determines their alliances, and is especially evident in that treaty of Westphalia which forms a portion of European international law at the present day, the fundamental idea of which is the assertion and guardianship of the legitimacy of *royal races.* Was it possible that the Europe of kings should either conceive or realize the idea of the peaceful organization and association of the nations?"

The first duty of reformers, therefore, was to establish the freedom and independence of their native land, because only by free nations could the future Alliance of the Peoples be formed; an alliance of free European families, "acknowledging neither man-king nor people-king." He believed such an alliance of the peoples to

be inevitable in the remote future, when each national family, should, after a given period of struggle and sacrifices, have established a representative form of Government, based upon a constitution framed in accordance with the national will. The separate nations, so constituted, each maintaining a distinct individual existence and acknowledging a distinct duty or mission to be performed for the benefit of the whole, would subsequently send their representatives to a European International Council, commissioned to frame, by mutual agreement and consent, a European Constitution, or International Law. In this future alliance of free European families, "the law of Duty, openly acknowledged and confessed, would take the place of that disposition to usurp the rights of others which has hitherto characterised king-governed nations, and which is naught other than the foresight of fear. The ruling idea of international statesmanship among free nations, would no longer be *to secure and perpetuate the weakness of others*, but *the amelioration of all through the work of all—the progress of each for the benefit of all the others.*"

It was in order to sow the seeds of these ideas, destined to bear fruit in the future, that Mazzini formed the German, French, Italian, and Polish exiles, by whom he was then surrounded, into a secret association, upon a similar model to that of YOUNG ITALY, and called YOUNG EUROPE, and drew up for them a declaration of principles founded upon the belief that the progress of humanity is destined to be worked out, under the guidance of the universal moral law, by the association of free and equal peoples.

The energy and constancy with which Mazzini devoted himself to the duty of inculcating principles so abstract, and the possible realization of which was so dis-

tant, have earned for him, from the weak or base majority, the title of Utopist or dreamer. They, however, who thus regarded him knew nothing of the man, and none of those who thus presumed to judge him were half so well aware as he was, of the remoteness of the "promised land." The conviction that he should never live to see it, early forced itself upon him; but it in no way affected his conduct. Individual hopes or joys he regarded as "flowers springing in the path of duty, but which may not change our course." On the day when "the first confused idea that the Italians could, and therefore ought, to struggle for the liberty of their country, first flashed before his mind;" it was, "never again to leave it." While yet a boy in years, he decided to sacrifice the natural bias of his mind towards literature and art, and "consecrate his life to the solution of the problem, *are we to have a country?*" telling himself that "if he were successful, the art of Italy would bloom and flourish over his grave." And throughout his life he pursued the same course. When the perception that any great truth *might* be won, or any great duty *could* and therefore *ought* to be fulfilled by his fellow men, flashed before his mind,—it was *never again to leave it*, and ensured his steadfast pursuit of every means, great or small, by which he could in any degree further or assist the accomplishment of the task.

Had an angel touched his eyes with his wing and revealed to him that the heavenly horizon was immeasurably more distant than he had before believed, he would, with the sad, indomitable smile his friends knew so well, have calmly pursued his journey. When, after his last imprisonment, he had mournfully spoken of the moral retrogression which the incapacity and corruption of monarchy and its tools had caused in Italy

a friend sought to convert the admission into an argument for his taking rest before recommencing his labours, he answered, "the more distant the goal the greater the need of struggling onwards 'without haste, and without rest.'"

The purpose for which he founded the Association of YOUNG EUROPE was in no sense immediate. He saw Switzerland, terrified at the threats of her stronger neighbours, driving the exiles to seek refuge elsewhere, and he desired that before being thus scattered among other peoples, each of them should be somewhat more fitted to prepare the minds of those whom they might encounter during their pilgrimage, for a future Federal organization of European democracy; so that the day might come when any people rising in insurrection against foreign or domestic tyranny, should find the other peoples of Europe ready to assist them, if not by action, at least by a moral sympathy and support sufficiently powerful to prevent their own governments from helping to crush the insurgent nation. "I knew," he says, "that such an organization embraced too vast a sphere to allow of any immediate practical results, and that much time and many severe lessons were required in order to teach the peoples the necessity of a true European fraternity, but I endeavoured to spread the idea of such a moral alliance among the peoples, knowing that the good seed once sown was certain to bear fruit in time."

Had the good seed borne early fruit, had the peoples learned the lesson of moral fraternity before 1848 and 49, we should not have seen the new-born Republic of Rome crushed by the Republic of France, and Hungary might have been free from that hour. She had defeated her tyrant Austria, and had the peoples known their duty to each other, Russia would not have been

allowed to re-rivet the chain which the Hungarian people had burst asunder.

The instinct of self-preservation, always strongly developed among despotic and aristocratic governments, rendered them keener sighted than the peoples of that day, and too wise to allow the Utopian dreamer to teach his dreams to their exiled subjects. Notes poured in upon Switzerland from every despotic power in Europe—but especially from France and Italy—demanding Mazzini's expulsion. But the people of the Canton where he lived were favourable to him, and in order to obtain some pretext for their injustice, the French and Italian embassies concocted an imaginary regicidal plot, in which he was declared to be implicated. The base deception was, however, unmasked by some of the Italian exiles, who seized upon the agent of the Governments and compelled him to give up his papers and instructions. The whole ignoble story may be found narrated in full in Louis Blanc's "*Histoire de Dix Ans*," and I only allude to it here in order to quote Mazzini's sternly true remarks upon the subject in his "Life and Works."

"The whole tribe of the gentry that go by the name of *Diplomatists, Ambassadors, Secretaries of Legation*, etc., etc., live and breathe in *lies* as in their native element. Yet the politicians of our day consider themselves honoured by their intercourse, and labour to obtain from them a smile or a shake of the hand. I should regard my own as contaminated by their touch. The highest among them is beneath the honest workman who roughly speaks the truth and blushes if convicted of wrong-doing."

When the Swiss Diet condemned Mazzini to perpetual exile from Switzerland, he "did but shrug his shoulders

and remain—searched for in vain on every side," and he should, he tells us, have remained indefinitely, had it not been for considerations regarding the health of two friends, also exiles, who lived with him. He decided to come to England in 1836,* a year rendered memorable to him by a crisis of moral suffering, which, as my aim in these pages is to make you acquainted with his soul, rather than his deeds, I deem it right to recount in his own noble and pathetic words.

"Were I to live for a century, I could never forget the close of that year, nor the moral tempest that passed over me, and amid the vortex of which my spirit was so nearly overwhelmed. I speak of it now with reluctance, and solely for the sake of those who may be doomed to suffer what I then suffered, and to whom the voice of a brother who has escaped from that tempest—storm-beaten and bleeding indeed, but with re-tempered soul—may perhaps indicate the path of salvation.

"It was the tempest of Doubt, which I believe all who devote their lives to a great enterprise, yet have not dried and withered up their soul—like Robespierre—beneath some barren intellectual formula, but have retained a loving heart, are doomed—once, at least—to battle through. My heart was overflowing with and greedy of affection; as fresh and eager to unfold to joy as in the days when sustained by my mother's smile; as full of fervid hope, for others at least, if not for myself. But during those fatal months there darkened around me such a hurricane of sorrow, disillusion, and deception, as to bring before my eyes, in all its ghastly nakedness, a foreshadowing of the old age of my soul, solitary, in a desert world, wherein no comfort in the struggle was vouchsafed to me.

* Mazzini arrived in England in Jauuary 1837.

"It was not only the overthrow, for an indefinite period, of every Italian hope; the dispersion of the best of our party; the series of persecutions which had undone the work we had done in Switzerland and driven us away from the spot nearest Italy; the exhaustion of our means and the accumulation of almost insurmountable material obstacles between me and the task I had set myself to do;—it was the falling to pieces of that moral edifice of faith and love, from which alone I had derived strength for the combat; the scepticism I saw rising around me on every side; the failure of faith in those who had solemnly bound themselves with me to pursue unshaken the path we had known at the outset to be choked with sorrows; the distrust I detected in those most dear to me as to the motives and intentions which sustained and urged me onward in the evidently unequal struggle. Even at that time the adverse opinion of the majority was a matter of little moment to me; but to see myself suspected of ambition or any other than noble motives, by the one or two beings upon whom I had concentrated my whole power of attachment, prostrated my spirit in deep despair. And these things were revealed to me at the very time when, assailed as I was on every side, I felt most intensely the need of comforting and re-tempering my spirit in communion with the fraternal souls I had deemed capable of comprehending even my silence, of divining all that I suffered in deliberately renouncing every earthly joy, and of smiling in suffering with me. Without entering into any details, I will merely say that it was precisely in this hour of need that these fraternal souls withdrew from me.

"When I felt that I was indeed alone in the world—alone, but for my poor mother, far away and unhappy also for my sake—I drew back in terror at the void

before me. Then, in that moral desert, doubt came upon me. Perhaps I was wrong and the world right? Perhaps my idea was indeed a dream? Perhaps I had been led, not by an idea, but by *my* idea; by the pride of my *own* conception; the desire of victory rather than the purpose of victory; an intellectual egotism, drying up and withering the spontaneous and innocent impulses of my heart, which would have led me to the modest virtues of a limited sphere, and to duties near at hand and easy of fulfilment.

"The day on which my soul was furrowed by these doubts, I felt myself not only unutterably and supremely wretched; I felt myself a criminal—conscious of guilt, yet incapable of expiation. The forms of those shot at Alexandria and Chambery* rose up before me like the phantom of a crime and its unavailing remorse. I could not recal them to life. How many mothers had I caused to weep! How many more must learn to weep should I persist in the attempt to rouse the youth of Italy to noble action—to awaken in them the yearning for a common country! And if that country were indeed an illusion—if Italy, exhausted by two epochs of civilisation, were condemned by Providence henceforth to remain subject to younger and more vigorous nations, without a name or a mission of her own—whence had I derived the right of judging the future, and urging hundreds, thousands of men to the sacrifice of themselves and of all that they held most dear?

"I will not dwell upon the effect of these doubts upon my spirit. I will simply say that I suffered so much as to be driven to the confines of madness. At

* After the expedition of Savoy, the prisoners were shot in cold blood, after the insurrection was vanquished, as the habit is with governments and "parties of order" everywhere.

times I started from my sleep at night, and ran to the window in delirium, believing that I heard the voice of Jacopo Ruffini calling to me. At times I felt myself irresistibly impelled to arise and go trembling into the room next my own, fancying that I should see there some friend whom I really knew to be at that time in prison, or hundreds of miles away. The slightest incident, a word, a tone, moved me to tears. Nature, covered with snow as it then was about Grenchen, appeared to me to wear a funereal shroud, beneath which it invited me to sink. I fancied I traced in the faces of those who surrounded me looks, sometimes of pity, but more often of reproach. Had that state of mind lasted but a little longer, I must either have gone mad, or ended it with the selfish death of the suicide. Whilst I was struggling and sinking beneath my cross, I heard a friend, whose room was a few doors distant from mine, answer a young girl, who, having some suspicion of my unhappy condition, was urging him to break in upon my solitude, by saying: *Leave him alone: he is in his element—conspiring, and happy.* Ah! how little can men guess the state of mind of others, unless they regard it—and this is rarely done—by the light of a deep affection.

"One morning I awoke to find my mind tranquil and my spirit calmed, as one who has passed through a great danger. The first moment of waking had always been one of great wretchedness with me; it was a return to an existence of little other than suffering; and during those months of which I have spoken, that first moment had been, as it were, a summing up of all the unutterable misery I should have to go through during the day. But on that morning it seemed as if nature smiled a smile of consolation upon me, and the light of day

appeared to bless and revive the life in my weary frame. The first thought that passed across my spirit was—*your sufferings are the temptations of egotism, and arise from a misconception of life.*

"I set myself to re-examine—now that I was able to do so calmly—both myself and surrounding things. I rebuilt my entire edifice of moral philosophy. In fact, the great question of a true or false conception of life is—whether recognised or not—the primary basis of all philosophy. The ancient religions of India had defined life as *Contemplation;* and hence the inertia, the immobility, and submerging of self in God, of the Arian families. Christianity had defined life as *Expiation;* and hence earthly sorrows were regarded as trials to be endured with resignation, even with gladness, and without any duty of struggling against them. Hence the earth was viewed as an abode of suffering; and the emancipation of the soul was to be achieved through indifference and contempt for *earthly* things.

"The materialism of the eighteenth century had gone back two thousand years to repeat the Pagan definition of life, as *a search after happiness;* and hence the spirit of egotism it instilled into the hearts of men under various disguises; hence the hateful spectacle of whole classes rising to do battle in the name of the happiness of *all* men, only to withdraw from the struggle and abandon their allies so soon as they had achieved their *own;* hence the instability and inconstancy of their most generous impulses, the sudden desertions whenever suffering overbalanced hope, and the sudden discouragement caused by the first adversity; hence the setting up of material interests above principles, and the many other evil results of that false theory—results which still endure.

"I perceived that although every instinct of my heart rebelled against that fatal and ignoble definition of life, yet I had not completely freed myself from the dominating influence exercised by it upon the age, and tacitly nourished in me by my early French studies, and the admiration I felt for those who had preached that doctrine, as well as an instinctive feeling of opposition to those governments and castes who denied the right to happiness of the multitude, in order to keep them prostrate and enslaved. I had combatted the evil in others, but not sufficiently in myself. In my own case, and as if the better to seduce me, that false definition of life had thrown off every baser stamp of material desires, and had centred itself in the affections, as in an inviolable sanctuary. I ought to have regarded them as a blessing of God, to be accepted with gratitude whenever it descended to irradiate or cheer my existence, not demanded them either as a right or as a reward. I had unconsciously made of them the condition of the fulfilment of my duties. I had been unable to realize the true ideal of love—love without earthly hope—and had unknowingly worshipped, not love itself, but the joys of love. When these vanished, I had despaired of all things; as if the joys or sorrows I encountered on the path of life could alter the aim I had aspired to reach; as if the darkness or serenity of heaven could change the purpose or necessity of the journey.

"I had been false to that faith in the immortality of life and in a progressive series of existences, which, in the eyes of the believer, transforms our sufferings here into the trials and difficulties of one who ascends a steep mountain, at the summit of which is God; a series of existences which are linked together, and gradually develop all that on earth is but a germ or promise. I

had denied the sun himself, because I found myself unable to light my feeble lamp by his ray. I had been a coward without knowing it. I, too, had given way to egotism, while I believed myself most free from it, simply because I had transported the *Ego* into a higher and purer sphere than that in which it is adored by the majority.

"Life is a mission. Every other definition of life is false, and leads all who adopt it astray. Religion, science, philosophy, though still at variance upon many points, all agree in this, that every existence is an *aim*. Were it not so, of what avail were the movement, the progress, which all are beginning to recognise as the law of life. And that aim is *one*,—to develope and bring into action all the faculties which constitute and lie dormant in human nature—*Humanity*—and cause them harmoniously to combine for the discovery and application of that law. But individuals, according to the time and space in which they live, have various secondary aims, all under the direction of and governed by that one supreme and permanent aim, and all tending to the constant further development and association of all the collective faculties and forces. For one man, this secondary aim may be to aid in the moral and intellectual development of the few immediately around him; for another, gifted with superior faculties, or placed in more favourable circumstances, the secondary aim is to promote the formation of a nationality, to reform the social condition of a people, to solve a political or religious question.

"Our own Dante understood this when more than five centuries ago, he spoke of *the great sea of Being*, upon which all existences were led, by power divine, towards *different ports*. Mankind is young yet, both

in knowledge and power, and a tremendous uncertainty still hangs over the determination of the special aims to which we are bound to devote ourselves. But the logical certainty that they do exist is sufficient, and it is enough to know that it is the part of each—if our lives are to be life indeed and not mere vegetation—to endeavour during the few years granted us on earth, more or less to purify and transform the element, the *medium* in which we live, in harmony with the one transcending aim.

"Life is a mission; duty, therefore, its highest law. In the comprehension of that mission and fulfilment of that duty lie our means of future progress, *the secret of the stage of existence into which we shall be initiated at the conclusion of this earthly stage.*

"Life is immortal; but the method and time of evolution through which it progresses is in our own hands. Each of us is bound to purify his own soul as a temple; to free it from egotism; to set before himself, with a religious sense of the importance of the study, the problem of his own life; to search out what is the most striking, the most urgent need of the men by whom he is surrounded, then to interrogate his own faculties and capacity, and resolutely and unceasingly apply them to the satisfaction of that need. And that examination is not to be undertaken in a spirit of mere analysis, which is incapable of revealing life, and *is ever impotent save when assisting or subserving some ruling synthesis;* but by hearkening to the voice of his own heart, concentrating *all* the faculties of his mind to bear upon the point; by the intuition, in short, of a loving soul, fully impressed with the solemnity of life. Young brothers, when once you have conceived and determined your mission within your soul, let nought arrest your steps.

Fulfil it with all your strength; fulfil it, whether blessed by love or visited by hate; whether strengthened by association with others, or in the sad solitude that almost always surrounds the martyrs of thought. The path is clear before you; you are cowards, unfaithful to your own future, if, in spite of sorrows and delusions, you do not pursue it to the end."

"Through what process of intellectual labour, I succeeded in arriving at a confirmation of my first faith, and resolved to work on so long as life should last, whatever the sorrows and revilings that might assail me, towards the great aim which had been revealed to me in the prison of Savona—the Republican unity of my country—I cannot detail here; nor would it avail. I noted down, at that time, a record of the trials and struggles I underwent, and the reflections which redeemed me, in long fragments of a work, fashioned after the model of *Ortis,** which I intended to publish anonymously, under the title of *Records of an Unknown.* I carried them with me, written in minute characters upon very thin paper, to Rome, and lost them in passing through France on my return. Were I now to endeavour to re-write the feelings and impressions of that period, I should find it impossible.

"I came to my better self alone; without aid from others, through the help of a religious conception, which I verified by history. From the idea of God, I descended to the conception of progress; from the conception of progress, to a true conception of life; to faith in a mission and its logical consequence—duty, the supreme rule of life; and having reached that faith, I swore to myself that nothing in this world should again make me doubt

* By Ugo Foscolo.

or forsake it. It was, as Dante says, passing through martyrdom to peace—'*a forced and desperate peace.*' I do not deny, for I fraternised with sorrow, and wrapped myself in it as in a mantle; but yet it was peace, for I learned to suffer without rebellion, and to live calmly, and in harmony with my own spirit. I bade a long, sad farewell to all individual hopes for me on earth. I dug, with my own hands, the grave, not of my affections,—God is my witness, that now, greyheaded, I feel them yet as in the days of my earliest youth—but of all the desires, exigencies, and ineffable comforts of affection; and I covered the earth over that grave, so that none might ever know the *Ego* buried beneath. From reasons—some of them apparent, some of them unknown, my life was, is, and were it not near the end, would remain unhappy; but never since that time have I for an instant allowed myself to think that my own unhappiness could in any way influence my actions. I reverently bless God the Father for what consolations of affection—I can conceive of no other—he has vouchsafed to me in my later years; and in them I gather strength to struggle with the occasional returns of weariness of existence. But even were these consolations denied me, I believe I should still be what I am. Whether the sun shine with the serene splendour of an Italian morn, or the leaden corpse-like hue of the northern mist be above us, I cannot see that it changes our duty. God dwells above the earthly heaven, and the holy stars of faith and the future still shine within our own souls, even though their light consume itself unreflected as the sepulchral lamp."

It is strikingly characteristic of Mazzini that while he thus writes with an emotion as intense as it is dignified

and restrained, of the moral trial by which his spirit was re-baptized in pain during the year that brought him to our shore, he recounts the material sufferings which he underwent during the first period of his exile in England, with absolute indifference, and simply in order to strengthen others to regard similar trials as lightly as he did himself. It is equally characteristic of his nature that he gives no explanation of the causes which produced the crisis of poverty he proceeds to relate, but this delicate omission may now be supplied. He came to England accompanied by three other Italian exiles, to whom he was deeply attached, who were, during that period, entirely dependent upon him. The modest allowance forwarded to him by his mother would have proved barely sufficient even for his own support, had he not, from the time when he inwardly resolved to devote his life to his country, deliberately trained himself in habits of Spartan simplicity, and it was, of course, totally inadequate to supply the necessities of four young men, in a strange land, of the customs and even language of which they were utterly ignorant; two of whom were, moreover, the opposite of their generous friend both in temper and habits, and added greatly to the sorrows and perplexities of that period by selfish repining and constant complaint at every privation or sacrifice. To such an extent was Mazzini's communion in affection carried, that his mother who, during these early years of exile forwarded even his clothes from Genoa, was compelled to select them of the coarsest and cheapest materials, as, owing to his resolute determination to share all things with his companions, she was compelled to furnish forth four exiles instead of one; aware that should she send a single suit of fine texture, it would immediately be sold

by her son, in order to purchase cheap clothing for all alike.

Since all who could have been pained by the revelation are dead, it appears not unworthy to relate how nobly the mother took her share in the life of silent abnegation chosen by her son. When Mazzini was first banished, his father, in the hope of inducing him to make such submission to the tyrants of Italy as might ensure a pardon, resolved to refuse him all means of support. The mother, better able to comprehend the exalted motives of her son's conduct; but unable to modify her husband's determination, continued, unknown to him, secretly to forward to her son throughout the whole period of their weary separation, a quarterly remittance sufficient to supply his frugal necessities had it been expended on himself alone, and by one of those sacred deceptions on which the angels smile, to keep him in ignorance of the constant personal abnegation and restriction by which the necessary sum was gathered together, to be forwarded always in the name of the father who had denied it. In all the contrivances and sacrifices necessary to accomplish this, she was greatly aided, during her short life, by her daughter Francesca; who regarded every privation undergone for the dearly loved exile, as light and easy. The details of the manifold secret privations by which the mother and sister maintained this loving and truly pious fraud, would fill a volume. Some of them were related to the present writer many years after, with mingled tears and laughter, when all necessity for deception was at an end, by the noble old mother herself, on the condition that the beloved object of such care and devotion should ever be kept in ignorance of the trials endured for his sake, and of the paternal harshness which had rendered them necessary. The

passage in which Mazzini describes his own part in this time of poverty is, as follows :—

"The moral crisis I had undergone in Switzerland was succeeded — partly in consequence of obligations I had contracted for Italian matters to which I had devoted the money sent to me by my parents for my personal use, and partly of expenses incurred for others —by a crisis of absolute poverty, which lasted during the whole of 1837 and half of 1838. I might have extricated myself from it by making known my condition to my father and mother, who would have made light of every sacrifice endured for my sake; but they had already sacrificed too much on my account, and I therefore thought it a duty to conceal it from them.

"I struggled on in silence. I pledged, without the possibility of redeeming them, the few dear souvenirs, either of my mother or others, which I possessed; then things of less value; until one Saturday I found myself obliged to carry an old coat and a pair of boots to one of the pawnbroker's shops, crowded on Saturday evenings by the poor and fallen, in order to obtain food for the Sunday. After this, some of my fellow-countrymen became security for me, and I dragged myself from one to another of those loan societies which drain the poor man of the last drop of blood, and often rob him of the last remnant of shame and dignity, by exacting from him forty or fifty per cent. upon a few pounds, which he is compelled to pay back in weekly payments, at certain fixed hours, in offices held in public houses, or gin and beer shops, among crowds of the drunken and dissolute.

"I passed, one by one, through all those trials and experiences, bitter enough at any time, but doubly so when they have to be encountered by one living solitary, uncounselled, and lost amid the immense multitude of

men unknown to him, in a country where poverty—especially in a foreigner—is an argument for a distrust often unjust, sometimes cruel. I, however, did not suffer from these things more than they were worth, nor did I feel either degraded or cast down by them. I should not even allude to trials of this nature, were it not that others, condemned to endure such, and disposed to feel humbled by them, may, perhaps, be helped by my example. I could wish that mothers would bear in mind that in the actual state of Europe, none of us is certain of remaining the arbitrator of his own destiny, or that of those dearest to him, and could be convinced that by giving their children a sterner education, fitting them for any position in life, they would provide better for their future welfare, for their true happiness and for their soul's good, than by surrounding them with every luxury and comfort, and thereby enervating the character that should be inured to fatigue and privation in early years. I have seen young Italians, tempered by nature for nobleness of life, sink miserably into crime, or save themselves by suicide from trials which I have undergone with a smile; and I have mentally cast the responsibility upon their mothers. My own mother—blessed be her memory!—with the earnest, deep-sighted love that looks forward to the future, had prepared me to stand unshaken in the midst of every misfortune."

Having surmounted that first stress of poverty, Mazzini began to support himself, and to aid the support of other exiles, by writing articles in the English reviews, and either by choosing Italian subjects or by frequent allusions to Italian matters, made these labours a means of calling English attention to the Italian question, and of preparing the way for the Italian apostolate he began in England after 1845, and to which he rightly attri-

buted the sympathy gradually aroused with the cause of Italian unity. It is alike a pleasure and a pride to quote in this place the testimony borne by him towards the close of his life, to the sincerity and durability of English friendship. He says :—

"Friendships once formed" (in England) "are firmly based, and sincerely proved, in action rather than in words, even among those who differ upon this or that question or opinion. Many of my ideas appeared then—some still appear—unrealizable or even dangerous to many English minds; but the logical proof of the sincerity of my convictions afforded by my life, sufficed to gain me the friendship of some of the best minds of the island. Nor shall I ever forget it while I live, nor ever proffer without a throb of gratitude the name of the land wherein I now write, which became to me almost as a second country, and in which I found the lasting consolation of affection, in a life embittered by delusions and destitute of all joy."

During Mazzini's first sojourn in England, in the year 1844, some devoted young Italians conceived the idea of an armed expedition against the despot of Naples, an idea which Mazzini, to whom the conspirators communicated their design, "reprehended and opposed" as immature and certain to lead only to fruitless bloodshed. I merely allude to it here because it was the occasion of that violation of his correspondence at the English Post Office, by order of our government, which led to the discovery of a long course of similar systematic turpitude, which has disgraced the aristocratic rulers of our country. The leaders of the proposed insurrection* were Austrian subjects, and it was at the request of the Austrian and Neapolitan governments, that English statesmen "prac-

* The brothers Baudiera.

tising the arts of Talleyrand and Fouché," had contrived covertly to open Mazzini's letters and transmit their contents to the despots abroad. The revelations thus made ended in the execution of the patriots concerned, and as Mazzini truly observes, "the English ministers had made themselves accomplices in that murder." In Mazzini's "Life and Works" ample details are given of the means by which he detected this infamy and, through the courage and persistency of Thomas Duncombe, exposed it in the House of Commons. Committees of inquiry were instituted in both Houses, and their reports, "though couched in language seeking rather to palliate the evil than to display it in all its ugliness," proved that from the year 1806 until the year 1844, all the ministers had successively degraded themselves by stooping to this method of obtaining information." "Not only my letters," says Mazzini, "and those of other exiles had been opened, but the letters of many Englishmen and M.P.'s had been violated, *and the crime had invariably been concealed by artifices punishable by the criminal law*—falsification of seals,* imitation of stamps, etc. My own letters had been opened for the space of more than four months." I shall not here relate the details of this treachery, the lie uttered in the House "upon his honour" by Lord Aberdeen, nor the calumnies insinuated against Mazzini by Sir James Graham, which he was afterwards compelled publicly to retract. On this subject Mazzini wrote at the time to the English papers, that "when statesmen once descend to play the part of liars and forgers, it is not to be wondered at that they should turn calumniators also."

I have alluded thus briefly to the disgrace then

* In all save the *irresponsible* servants of the people.

brought upon England by her aristocratic rulers, because it affords a striking and terrible illustration of the evils of that system of "secret diplomacy," which is one of the bulwarks of the monarchical system. "The fact of placing a king at the head of the social edifice creates the necessity of seeking the support and approval of foreign monarchies," of "concessions to foreign courts;" of "trust in and respect for diplomacy," the doings of which, as its chief aim both abroad and at home is "repression of the popular element," must of necessity be concealed from the masses. Even in our own *constitutional* monarchy, the foreign policy and practice of the ministry is always, and the home policy is frequently, concealed from the representatives of the people. The whole aristocratic theory upon which constitutional monarchy is founded, will, Mazzini says, "cease to prevail amongst us when the spirit of that word DEMOCRACY which is ever upon our lips shall have entered into our hearts, and taught us to *feel* that the honest working man is no whit less noble than the descendant of generations of kings; that to touch the hand of the last, is of no more mark than to grasp the hand of the first, and when we understand that *the government of the State should be carried on precisely as individuals manage their private affairs, by entrusting them to men of intelligence and probity in whatever sphere they find those qualities united.*"

Commenting upon the disgraceful incident of the opening of his letters, he adds:—

"Every Government founded on the absurd privilege of hereditary power, and maintained by such empty formula as '*the head of the State reigns but does not govern;*' '*the maintenance of a perennial equilibrium between powers is the true method of progress,*' and the

similar stock phrases of constitutional monarchies—is *inevitably drawn into immorality sooner or later.* Instead of deriving their inspirations from the action of the collective conscience upon the individual conscience, they draw them from the fictions and imaginary laws in force in a small and privileged fraction of society, and are of necessity in a constant state of antagonism, more or less open, with the unprivileged classes. And every existence bearing within it a radical vice of artificiality and immorality, wanders astray from the truth, and from that communion with humanity which leads to truth. Thus these statesmen, naturally good and honest, but having been taught to venerate the artificial formulæ fabricated to sustain an artificial conception, (monarchy), —remote from the true and innate nature of things, had gradually lost that just moral sense that inculcates the *oneness* of life, and they consequently committed themselves, *as statesmen,* to actions from which they would have shrunk with horror as *private individuals.*

. . . . .

"If the majority of men at the present day were not mentally slavish and educated by the usages of monarchical countries to regard the man less than the habit he wears—if, *rejecting the immoral distinction between the politician and the private individual,* and understanding that the first, *precisely because he assumes the position of a leader and instructor of the nation, has a still greater duty of scrupulous honesty*—all his fellow-statesmen had punished Lord Aberdeen's fault with due severity; if, on the day after the utterance of the *lie,* the door of friendly intercourse had been closed upon him as upon a dishonoured man, the lesson would have been of great avail, at least to his successors. But the *prestige* of aristocracy and high office prevailed over

the English moral sense; and while the country declared its hostility to the abuse, it allowed its perpetrators to remain in the Ministry.

"Therefore, the secresy of correspondence is violated at the present day, precisely as it was in 1844, though, perhaps, somewhat more rarely."

During the first year of Mazzini's life in England, the same loving tenderness towards the poor which had distinguished him from early childhood, was characteristically shown in his successful attempts to mitigate the sufferings and improve the minds of his poorer fellow-countrymen. "It was," he says, "a logical consequence of my opinions and belief that I should endeavour to work not only *for* the people, but *with* the people; and I had found the few Italian workmen with whom I had come in contact since my arrival in London, so disinterested and worthy as greatly to encourage me in making the attempt. Until then, I had few opportunities of studying that precious element of our nation —the working class. An opportunity was unexpectedly presented to me, and I eagerly embraced it.

"By conversing occasionally with some of the lads who wander the streets of the vast city playing upon the organ, I learned with profound grief and astonishment the history and method of a traffic carried on by a few speculators, only to be qualified as a species of white slave trade; a disgrace to Italy, to its Government, and to its clergy, who might—had they chosen to do so—have prevented it. . . .

"I sought a method of alleviating the sufferings of those poor boys, and founded an association for their protection, and a gratuitous school wherein they might learn something of their duties and their rights, and be able to give good counsel to their fellow-country-

men on their return. On several occasions I brought those of the masters who had been guilty of violence, to justice in the English courts; and when they found they were watched, they gradually became less cruel and arbitrary in their conduct." This school was kept open —Mazzini personally supplying the greater part of the funds, and sharing in the labour of teaching the scholars —from 1841 till 1848, when he left England. He says of it: "During those seven years, we gave both moral and intellectual instruction to several hundred youths and children who were in a state of semi-barbarism; and who, half afraid at first, and urged only by curiosity, came to our humble rooms at 5 Hatton Garden, to be gradually tamed and civilised by the gentleness and kindness of the masters; until at length they learned to rejoice with a certain conscious pride in the idea of returning to their country possessed of education.

"They used to come between nine and ten o'clock at night, bringing their organs with them. We taught them reading, writing, arithmetic, simple geography, and the elements of drawing. On the Sunday evenings we gathered all our scholars together, to listen to an hour's lecture upon Italian history, the lives of our great men, the outlines of natural philosophy—any subject, in short, that appeared to us calculated to elevate those unformed minds, darkened by poverty and their state of abject subjection to the will of others. Nearly every Sunday evening for two years I lectured to them upon Italian history or elementary astronomy; a subject eminently religious, and calculated to purify the mind, which, reduced to popular phraseology and form, should be among the first subjects chosen for the education of man. . . . It was a second period of fraternal labour and love, refreshing to my own heart and to the hearts of

other weary exiles; fortifying them in serious thought and earnest purpose. It was indeed a holy work, holily fulfilled. Every assistance given was gratuitous. . . . all who in any way aided in the education of our scholars, were unpaid. Yet they were all of them men who had families to support by their own exertions. . . . On the 10th November every year (the anniversary of the opening of our school) we invited all our pupils—about 200—to a distribution of small prizes, which was followed by a modest supper, carved and served by ourselves and enlivened by patriotic songs and the improvisations of the director. One of those evenings was equal, in moral influence and effect, to a whole year of mere *instruction*. Those unfortunate lads whom their masters treated like slaves, learned to feel that they were men; our equals; living souls. Many English friends, both men and women, came to our workmen's supper and went away touched and improved themselves. The school, as I have said, afforded me a means of contact with the Italian workmen in London. I selected the best among these to help me in a work more directly national in its purpose. We formed an association of working men, and published a journal called *The Popular Apostolate*, bearing as a motto these words: '*Work and its proportionate recompense.*' The tendency of my writings in that paper may be judged from the *Duties of Man.*" *

This association was the first of a vast series since formed, either personally by Mazzini, or through his direct influence in Italy, and there is not at this time a single important town in his native land, which does not boast some such association of working men thus owing its existence to him.

* Reprinted in the present volume.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ITALIAN REVOLUTIONS 1848.

WHILE thus finding "rest and refreshment" in works of benevolence, Mazzini laboured unceasingly towards the moral and political education of the Italian people, and through the medium of the clandestine press and a prodigiously extended secret correspondence, contrived to arouse an indomitable spirit of national independence, and to weave a web of conspiracy over the whole country. He also, by spreading accounts of Garibaldi's exploits as a guerrilla chief in South America, created for him the splendid reputation which prepared the people to accept him as hero and leader on his arrival in Europe in 1848.

When Pius IX. ascended the throne in '46, the Italians, seduced by the novel spectacle of a Pope commencing his reign by granting an amnesty for political offenders, rashly credited him with patriotic sympathies, and imagined him capable of putting himself at the head of the movement for Italian independence. Mazzini, then in England, was repeatedly urged to give the support of his name and approval to the throng of Pope worshippers who already proclaimed Pius IX. the "initiator of the future destiny of Italy." Being then, as ever, too acute and too logical to put faith in princes, he replied that so soon as the Pope should initiate it in fact, he would be the first to follow the banner raised.

"But where," he added, "is the banner you would have me support? The only banner I recognise is the banner of the nation, of *Unity*. For this I would renounce for a time whatever device I might desire to see inscribed on our flag; but this I can never renounce. I should believe myself unfaithful to God, my country, and my own soul. . . . Any policy which does not begin and end with that word Unity, I consider not merely negatively useless, but positively harmful. . . . . In the Pope, I see nothing but a well-disposed man . . . . . wavering between the influence of Austria and his own tendencies, but without any of those Italian intentions which others have been determined to see in his first acts. If I am wrong, the first *fact* will correct me, and I am quite ready to be convinced." Nevertheless, he addressed a letter to the Pope, pointing out to him the great religious and national mission which he might, at that moment, have accomplished, and allowed the letter to be published, in order to illustrate to his countrymen the contrast between the Pope's duty and his conduct.

Six months afterwards the bubble burst; the Pope ceased to play the Italian patriot, and assumed his true character as King-Priest. The Moderates who had, until then, asserted that the sole salvation for Italy was the union of the pastoral crook with the sword, now declared that the *sword of Italy** sufficed alone. The people, however, unsheathed the only sword really able to save Italy, in Sicily (1847), and Lombardy (1848.) Were there no other source of information as to the events of this period, the documents contained in the English Blue Books for the years '48 and '49 would suffice to show that every step made towards unity in

* The Moderate journals had already baptized the king "the Sword of Italy."

those years was the result of Mazzini's previous teachings and influence over his countrymen. and that had they continued to listen to him, instead of being dazzled and led astray by the brilliant promises of the King of Piedmont, not only might the disastrous termination of the war and the return of the Austrians have been prevented, but Italy might, in all human probability, have been united at that time. The insurrectionary movement which spread like molten lava over the whole soil of Italy in '48, was declared by Austrian statesmen to be the result of Mazzini's seventeen years apostolate, in a "*Plan for the Pacification of Italy*," discussed by the council of ministers at Vienna and sent to Lord Palmerston. That document speaks of "the germ of Italian nationality, so long buried, but *resuscitated by the efforts of Young Italy*," as having "brought on the events which we have witnessed; for the universal cry of 'Death to the Austrians' arose, not first from Lombardy or Venetia" (the provinces under the rule of Austria), "but from the depths of Sicily, where Austria had never exercised any oppressive influence, and traversed the whole Peninsula until it reached the Italian Tyrol* which had appeared sincerely attached to the monarchy." † Prince Metternich, who, like all despots and the servants of despots, regarded the people as a "faction," and dreaded the sentiment of nationality, wrote as early as August 11, 1847, "the *factions* are endeavouring to accomplish an undertaking which could not be confined within the estates of the church, nor within the limits of any one of the states which, in their

* The reader will remember that the territory to which the name 'Italian Tyrol' was given by Austria, belonged, in the days of Italian freedom, to the republic of Venice.

† *Vide* Blue Book, "Correspondence relating to the affairs of Italy, 1849."

ensemble, constitute the Italian Peninsula. The factions seek to merge these states into one political body."*

The Prince was right as to the universality of the sentiment of nationality "resuscitated" by Mazzini in the hearts of his countrymen. The attempt made by the brothers Bandiera to rouse Naples against the Bourbon in 1844 was, as their letters to Mazzini proved,† a deliberate act of martyrdom for the sake of the national idea. Devoutly convinced of the truth proclaimed by YOUNG ITALY that it was the first duty of the Italians to throw off the yoke of their foreign and domestic tyrants, in order to unite their dismembered country, they were "impatient to bear witness. '*Italy*,' they said, '*will live when Italians shall learn how to die.* And for that there is no teaching but example.'" Mazzini tells us, however, that believing that the hour was at hand for a vaster and more decisive movement, and anxious to preserve those precious lives for better combined efforts, he "struggled desperately" to induce them to live, in order to join in these; and he might have succeeded in persuading them, had not the Neapolitan and Austrian Governments, alarmed at the information sent to them by the English ministry,‡ "thrown the weight of all their scoundrelism into the scale." The victims were deliberately betrayed by false information furnished by the spies of the Neapolitan Tyrant, and then shot in cold blood.

After the first discouragement produced by their execution had subsided, however, it became evident that their example had borne fruit in the hearts of their

* Correspondence relating to the affairs of Italy, 1849.
† The letters opened at the English post-office.
‡ *Vide* page 64 *et seq.*

countrymen. Manifestations against Austria had already begun in the States of the Pope in 1846, and at Genoa in 1847, in which year the Sicilian revolution against the Tyrant of Naples was triumphant. The leaders of that revolution had long been in secret correspondence with Mazzini, and with the national party in Tuscany, Piedmont, Rome, etc. And when the Lombards rose against their Austrian rulers in March 1848, the news was received with ecstasy, and the most enthusiastic sympathy was evinced in every part of Italy. Volunteer companies were formed in every province; the princes being compelled to give way before the popular excitement, and even the Grand Duke of Tuscany (himself an Austrian prince) was driven to declare war against Austria in order to save his own throne. The volunteers of Genoa were the first to assemble, but before the end of March, 10,000 Romans and 7000 Tuscans had armed and enrolled themselves to aid their Lombard countrymen. The very capitalists of Italy were inspired by patriotism, and subscribed large sums of money to the loan raised by the Provisional Government of Milan, without demanding interest. Large bodies of volunteers pursued the retreating Austrians to the Alps, and the reports of the agents of the English Government show, that in less than one month after the insurrection of Milan, Austria had only 50,000 men left in Italy, and these were vanquished, exhausted, and disorganized.

The events of those years proved the justice of Mazzini's revolutionary logic. While the insurrections of 1821 and 1833 had failed because the leaders had neglected to appeal to the masses, the revolutions of 1847, '48, and '49 succeeded because they were the work of the people, awakened to new life by YOUNG ITALY.

"They are marching straight to a Republic," wrote the clear-sighted Austrian statesman quoted above, and it is enough to read the lists of those who fell at Milan, Brescia, Bologna, Vicenza, Rome, etc., in order to perceive that at least nine-tenths of those who died for their country's freedom in 1848 and 1849, belonged to the popular class. But the enemies of popular rights were already grouping themselves around the King of Piedmont, and organizing that so-called "moderate party," which gradually diverted the Italian people from their straight march towards a republic, and against the anti-national and corrupting influence of which, Mazzini then commenced that struggle of principle against expediency, honesty against diplomacy, and duty against self-interest, destined to endure throughout the remainder of his life. "The very name of the party was," he says, "significant: they styled themselves *moderates*, as if, in the then dismembered state of Italy, when the question was between existence and annihilation, between the future nation and the petty princedoms which, under the wing of Austria, contested that nation's development, there could exist a middle course. . . . They were royalists, willing to admit a certain infusion of liberty—enough, and not more than enough, to make monarchy tolerable; ready to assert for themselves the right of publishing their own opinions, and of taking their seats in a Constitutional Assembly, but without extending the same liberty to the masses, through fear of awakening in them an idea of rights which the Moderates detested, and of duties for which they had no reverence. . . . The problem which they set themselves to solve was the *reconciliation of impossibilities*—liberty with princedom; nationality with dismember-

ment; and strength with uncertainty and disunion in the guidance of the movement. . . . . Many of the leaders did not desire unity; none of them believed it possible . . . . Alliances between the petty sovereigns was the ideal of all the thinkers among them, from Balbo to Cavour," * and when the thrones of the most insignificant of these had been swept away by revolution, the highest ambition of the Moderates was to divide Italy into three, by the formation of a Kingdom of the North (that is to say, an aggrandised Piedmont), a Kingdom of the South (under the ferocious Bourbon, transformed for the moment into a constitutional king), and an enlarged Papal Princedom in the Centre. Certain squabbles between Austria and Piedmont, in a matter of custom-house duties in 1847, had already afforded the Moderates an opportunity of vapouring in their journals against "the national enemy," and (the articles having been tolerated by King Charles Albert) of industriously circulating imaginary anecdotes illustrative of that monarch's secret sympathy with the popular sentiment, and his warlike "intentions," etc. "The Pope having failed them," wrote Mazzini to a friend, "they are now going mad about the *First Captain in Italy*, and when he fails them, they will go mad about the Grand Duke, or God knows whom." But when asked to countenance the king-worship, which had taken the place of Pope-worship, he answered:—"Notwithstanding all my aversion for Charles Albert, as the executioner of my

* It is worthy of note that Cavour learned nothing by experience in this respect. Only one year before his death, while the revolution was raging in Sicily, and Garibaldi was meditating his descent upon Naples, Cavour, who had shortly before publicly declared the unity of Italy "a utopian dream," was plotting with Louis Napoleon and King Bomba, a triple alliance, intended to secure the kingdom of the south to that blood-stained monarch, and place the cousin of the "magnanimous ally" on the throne of Central Italy.

best friends, and the contempt I feel for his weak and cowardly nature—notwithstanding all the democratic yearnings of my own heart, yet, could I believe him to possess enough even of true ambition to *unite* Italy for his own advantage, I could cry amen."

But the Moderates neither hoped nor desired to form the divided populations of their native land into one strong and compact nation. They were utterly unprepared for the national insurrection which burst forth at Milan in 1848, and was entirely the work of that popular element which they had always either ignored or misunderstood; and even after the people had been fighting for three days, the upper classes and municipal authorities issued a proclamation "regretting the abandonment of *legal* measures" (towards foreign usurpers), and proposing an armistice. The people went on fighting without heeding them, and on the fifth day, the Austrians fled in disorder from Milan, leaving 4000 dead. The Venetian insurrection which followed and was accomplished with extraordinary rapidity, placed the mountain passes leading from Italy into Austria in the hands of the volunteers, thus rendering it impossible for the Austrians, then in full retreat towards the frontier, either to cross into their own territory, or receive supplies. Whole regiments of Italian soldiers deserted from the Austrian service, and three Austrian vessels, manned by Italian sailors, surrendered to Venice, which had proclaimed the Republic. "The Milanese insurrection had sounded the tocsin of the Italian insurrection."

The Moderates perceived that the cause of monarchy would be lost in Italy unless they could drag one of their princes into the struggle. The people had learned the first lesson taught by YOUNG ITALY—the duty of

winning back their country from the usurper. Should they be left to conquer alone, they would feel their own power, and put in practice the second lesson, of popular rights, and proclaim the Republic. The Moderates, therefore, despatched messengers to Charles Albert of Piedmont, imploring him to take the direction of the movement, and warning him that, should he delay to do so, he would "hear the Republic proclaimed." So long as the issue of the contest appeared doubtful, the King declined to receive their envoys, but when it became evident that the revolution would be victorious in Milan, he sent to offer the assistance of his army to carry on the war in the provinces, *on condition that a Provisional Government should be formed, which should draw up a proposal to give Lombardy to the Crown of Piedmont.* Count Martini, "the commercial traveller of the Moderates," as Mazzini calls him, made this proposal to one of the leading Republicans,* saying, "Don't you know that it is not every day one has a chance of rendering such a service to a King?" "To a King!" says Mazzini, commenting on this; "the humblest of the workmen fighting cheerfully on the barricades for the banner of Italy, without stopping to ask what men would reap the reward of their victory, was worthier in the sight of God, and will one day be worthier in the sight of Italy, than fifty crowned Kings."

On the very day when the Austrian General (Radetsky) fled from Milan with the remains of the army, when the volunteers from his own provinces of Piedmont and Sardinia were forcing their way into the Lombard territory, and to hold back any longer would not only have destroyed all chance of acquiring Lombardy to his

* Cattaneo.

crown, but must have cost him that crown itself, Charles Albert declared war against Austria. That this step was taken solely in order to undo the work accomplished by YOUNG ITALY is amply shown, not merely by the King's private assurances to the other European Courts, but by the official reports of our agents in Italy to Lord Palmerston, who, after relating that the insurrection had spread to "all the neighbouring towns and villages," so that "all the country bordering on the States of His Sardinian Majesty was in flames," declare that, owing to "the spirit of nationality which is powerfully excited, . . . there is in the provinces and in the capital such an agitation that it is to be feared that from one moment to another a revolution might burst forth which would put the throne in great danger. . . . The danger of the proclamation of a Republic in Lombardy is imminent. . . . The situation of Piedmont is such that at any moment, at the announcement that the Republic has been proclaimed in Lombardy, a similar movement might burst forth in the States of His Majesty."*

After the proclamation of war against Austria, our agents conveyed to Lord Palmerston the assurances of the Piedmontese Ministers that "the King had only commenced hostilities *to maintain order* in a territory left by force of circumstances without a *master*,"† and in consequence of "the immense influence exercised by the people, who threatened to revolt in Piedmont and to attack the Austrians *in spite of* the authority of the Government, and the imminent danger of the monarchy of Savoy, which had *forced* the Ministry to take up arms."‡ They saw "reason to fear that the numerous

* Correspondence relating to the affairs of Italy, 1849.
† Idem. ‡ Idem.

political associations existing in Lombardy and the proximity of Switzerland might cause the Republican Government to be proclaimed, which would have been fatal . . . to the august dynasty of Savoy. The Government and the King have not hesitated, and they are profoundly convinced that they have acted, at the risk of all the danger to which they have exposed themselves, *for the safety of all other monarchical States.*"*

Such were the true reasons which induced the Moderates and *the Sword of Italy* to declare war. To the people they held, of course, a different language. The King's proclamation declared that he came "to lend the people of Lombardy that assistance which brother may expect from brother;" and in order to quiet the republicans, the Provisional Government issued a manifesto, saying, "We have solemnly and repeatedly declared that, *after the struggle*, it would belong to the people to decide upon its own destinies," and promising to "wait till every portion of Italian soil be free; when all are free, all will speak." Mazzini accepted this programme of neutrality, and loyally abided by it. It is true that, although unaware at that time of any deliberate treachery on the part of the king, he had no belief that he would prove equal to the task before him, but he held it to be "especially the duty of the Republicans to teach obedience to the national will," and therefore exerted all his influence to induce the republican party to rally round the Provisional Government, to abstain from all political propaganda during the war, and to concentrate all their energies on the conquest of the independence of the country from foreign rule; so that the will of the whole nation might be freely

* Correspondence relating to the affairs of Italy, 1849.

declared in the choice of the form of government to be adopted in the future.

No portion of Mazzini's career has been more persistently misrepresented by the venal monarchical press of Italy, and more completely misunderstood in England, that this period of noble self-abnegation, during which he was first betrayed and then calumniated by the Moderates. They, being already pledged to the cession of Lombardy to the crown, stupidly imagined that the best means of bringing it about was to enable the king to conquer alone, and thus compel the people to make choice between his rule and that of the hated Austrians. Upon every skirmish which took place between the royal troops and the enemy, the Provisional Government posted proclamations on the walls of Milan, announcing news from the camp of an important victory, so that towards the middle of the campaign, when the incapacity or treachery of the king's generals had allowed the Austrians to become once more really dangerous, the deluded citizens believed them to be nearly exterminated. The volunteers, meanwhile, whom the king dreaded because they were Republicans, were first recalled from the duty of protecting the passes of the Alps leading to Austria, and then disbanded. Communication with headquarters being thus thrown open to him, General Radetsky was enabled to re-victual and reinforce his army at his leisure.

When the Austrians had taken Udine, the Provisional Government were struck with terror, and sent at midnight to summon Mazzini to their council, asking him in what manner they should inform the people, whom they had so long deluded, that the hour was at hand when they would have to submit to their former masters, or save themselves by a supreme effort of popular

energy. Mazzini implored them to make known the whole truth at once, to call for a *levée en masse*, and the reorganization of the disbanded volunteers, engaging to form a legion at once in Milan, provided he were allowed to place his own name at the head of the list. Consent was given, but withdrawn immediately after, because the king's secretary * had declared that *his master "did not want an army of enemies in his rear."*

An attempt was made to quiet the voice of Mazzini who persisted, though unbelieved, in declaring the truth as to the failure of the war, by magnificent offers of royal favour. A messenger was sent to him from the camp, to propose that he should constitute himself patron of the royal scheme of uniting Lombardy to the crown, offering him, in that case, power to draw up the constitution of the new "kingdom of the north," an interview with the king, and the position of first minister of the crown. The one aim of his life had been the unity of Italy, and for this, as he declared to the king's envoy, he would have sacrificed every minor point; but the all-important question of the day was *war with Austria*, and he knew that the formation of a kingdom of the north would prove fatal to the war. Such an aggrandizement of Piedmont would furnish all the other Princes of Italy with an excuse for jealous enmity, as the open abandonment of the national idea had already extinguished the enthusiasm and sympathy of the populations of the neighbouring states. The only way to rekindle this would be, to transform the war into a war to free the whole nation. If the king would risk his Piedmontese crown for an Italian crown, and become really and truly that *Sword of Italy* which the

* Castagneto.

Moderates declared him; openly break with all the other governments of Italy (since, in such case, all would be hostile to him), and rally round him all the patriots of Italy, from the Alps to the sea, so as to prove himself to be acting in earnest, Mazzini would, in his turn, use every effort to bring to his aid all the revolutionary elements of Italy. Being asked by the king's envoy what guarantee he should require, he drew up a few lines to the above effect for the king to sign. The monarch, of course, refused, and Castagneto reported of Mazzini, that he "perceived there was nothing to be done in that quarter."

At length, the repeated successes of the Austrians compelled the Moderates to own to the people that fresh supplies of men and arms were wanting, but they declared that if the Lombards would prove their confidence in the king by voting for the cession of their province to his crown, millions of francs and thousands of soldiers would be forthcoming from his subjects. By such representations the vote was obtained from the deluded population, and, to the triumph of the Moderates, the real object of the royal war achieved, for all danger of the Republic was, for the time, averted, and *a precedent*—as diplomatists call it—acquired for the royal House of Savoy. That this was the true aim of the war was further proved by the fact that no sooner had the same arts been successful in inducing the Venetians to follow the example of the Milanese, and to give themselves to the king, than two royal commissioners were despatched to take possession of the doomed city in the name of Charles Albert, *although he had, two days before, handed it over, by secret treaty, to the Austrians.*

Shortly after the success of the royal intrigue, news

of the retreat of the Piedmontese troops upon Milan, followed by Radetsky, with a refreshed and now victorious army, awakened the people to a sense of the deceptions practised upon them, and the word "treason" circulated from mouth to mouth. "The proposal was many times made to me," says Mazzini, "to overthrow the Provisional Government, and attempt to save the country through other men. The undertaking would have been easy, but to what end? A sudden change of government in Milan would have lighted up a civil war, and, without saving the country from the Austrians, would have cast a stain upon the republican banner in the eyes of the still-blinded masses of the rest of Italy. The vote which had ceded Lombardy to the crown would have given the king the right of sending troops *to protect order and his* government. We should have found ourselves confronted by the bayonets of our Italian brothers, and Austria would have profited by our discords. . . . I therefore refused. I did more; I prevented the attempt. In our eyes, the fate of the war had long been decided. We foresaw that the royal army would be routed, and the country left defenceless. . . . It did not require the intuition of genius to foretell the course which events subsequently took, and which it was no longer in human power to prevent."

I have not space to recount the royal betrayal of Milan which followed. The Austrians everywhere vanquished the king's troops, and the retreat of his army upon Milan resembled a flight. Even the Moderates perceived their error, too late, and in their despair addressed themselves to Mazzini, whom they had calumniated as "an ally of Austria" when he sought to undeceive the population, for advice and help

in their extremity. He at once organized a Committee of Defence, hoping, he says, that the attack upon Milan by the Austrians "might again transform into giants the people of the barricades," and rekindle the Lombard war. All his efforts were directed to prepare for the people's defence of their own city. In the moment of danger he regained all his influence with the population. "In those days," he says, "the spectacle afforded by the people was the most irresistible condemnation of the royal war and the system of the Moderates . . . the population awakened again to sublime life, prepared arms for the defence; *scented their own battle,* and hailed it with joy."

But all these hopes of a people's war were destroyed by the news that the king was coming to defend the city with forty thousand men. He was preceded by Royal Commissioners, who, in virtue of the vote of fusion, assumed the executive power. "I saw them," says Mazzini, "and heard their words to the multitude assembled under the windows of their palace . . . . I traversed the streets of Milan, studying the faces and the words of men, and I despaired. *The people believed themselves saved; they were, therefore, irrevocably lost.* I left the city—God alone knows with what grief—and joined Garibaldi's column at Bergamo."

The whole story of this period shows that the king took the field, not against the enemies of Italy, but against the national and republican sentiments kindled by Mazzini in the Italian people.

On the next day the king entered the city, and publicly promised to defend it; although *he had already signed an armistice with Radetsky, one of the articles of which was the surrender of the town.* Having addressed the people from the window of the palace, swearing

that he and his sons would fight with them to the death, he fled by night by a back way, withdrew his army from the walls, and abandoned the city to the Austrian troops, who immediately entered.

Garibaldi was then at Bergamo, with a small body of republican volunteers, and believing that the king, who was still at the head of an army of forty thousand men, would keep his word and defend Milan, he conceived the bold project of pushing forward to aid the future operations which the king's resistance at Milan might bring about. Colonel Medici thus relates Mazzini's coming amongst the volunteers, rifle on shoulder, asking to join the ranks as a simple soldier of the legion he commanded. "A general acclamation saluted the great Italian, and the legion unanimously confided its banner, which bore the device—*God and the people*, to his charge. . . . The march was very fatiguing—rain fell in torrents—we were drenched to the skin. Although accustomed to a life of study, and little fit for the violent exertion of forced marches, his constancy and serenity never forsook him for an instant, and notwithstanding our counsels—for we feared for his physical strength—he would never stay behind, nor leave the column. It even happened that, seeing one of our youngest volunteers clothed only in linen, and consequently with no protection against the rain and sudden cold, he forced him to accept and wear his own cloak. Arrived at Monza, we heard the fatal news of the capitulation of Milan, and learned that a numerous body of Austrian cavalry had been sent against us. . . . Garibaldi . . . not wishing to expose his small band to utter and useless destruction, gave orders to fall back, and placed me with my column as rear-guard to cover the retreat. . . . My column, always pursued by the enemy, and

menaced with destruction at every moment by a very superior force, never wavered, but remained compact and united, ... and kept the enemy in check to the last. In this march, full of danger, and difficulty, the strength of soul, intrepidity, and decision, which Mazzini possesses in such a high degree, never failed, and were the admiration of the bravest amongst us. His presence, his words, the example of his courage, animated our young soldiers, who were, besides, proud of partaking such dangers with him. . . . His conduct has been a proof that to the greatest qualities of the civilian, he joins the courage and intrepidity of the soldier."*

But Milan having fallen, all Lombardy fell; Garibaldi's volunteers keeping the field as long as it was humanly possible, and yielding only to overpowering numbers, the last of all. Mazzini and some of the best of these struggled hard to rekindle the insurrection among the mountains, but he tells us that his efforts were rendered fruitless by the intrigues of the Moderates, who, "unable *to do*, endeavoured to *undo*, and laboured, as they still labour, to dissolve."† Among other writings published shortly afterwards by Mazzini in Switzerland, was an address to the youth of Italy, recapitulating for their instruction the moral causes which had led to the fall of Lombardy, by the substitution of doctrines of *expediency* and *opportunity*, for great principles. The title page bore the following significant epigraph from Euclid, "*The right line is the shortest between two given points*," and the writer sadly and

* The writer of the above is now a General in the King's service, and he it was who, as Governor of Palermo, arrested and imprisoned his former leader, in 1870.

† Written in 1861.

indignantly warned the Italians that "nations cannot be regenerated by a lie."

Mazzini tells us that even while he foresaw the ruin of the royal war, one hope still cheered his saddened spirit, and that hope was named Venice. "The republican flag still waved over Venice, and I believed that when imbecility and treason should have done their work in Lombardy, the eyes of all men—cleared from deceitful visions—would be fixed upon that banner. Venice would then become a new centre of resistance, a new leader of the people's war." Manin, however, who had been the soul of the defence of Venice against her foreign foe, lacked the revolutionary energy requisite to carry on the war after the armistice had been treacherously signed by the Italian king, and in virtue of that armistice, the Austrians shortly afterwards re-entered the betrayed city.

"Treason and imbecility" had done their work too well, and Mazzini, seeing that all was hopelessly over in Lombardy, went by way of France to Tuscany.

"We republicans," he says, "had offered ourselves as loyal allies to the royal camp; we never declared that camp our own. We ceased from preaching our own principle, in order to avoid all disunion likely to endanger the success of the enterprise against the foreign foe; but we never preached in favour of the opposite principle. I say this, remembering how many of those who were sworn republicans yesterday, are monarchists to-day; and this not because they have really altered their convictions, but simply through what they call *tactics*, but what is, in fact, the absence of all belief. . . . They cast both the present and the future of the country at the feet of the monarchy—accepting *unconditionally* the institution they preached

against but a few years before. . . . The people, viewing their Macchiavellian gyrations, learn a lesson of immorality, or of equally fatal distrust."

"The few who in 1848 remained faithful to the republican flag showed that they knew how to respect the will of the people, supreme even when erring, and yet preserve themselves pure and incontaminate. And if I insist upon this fact, it is because . . . the majority—still deluded by the calumnies spread against us at that time—imagine even yet that it was our rash and intemperate republicanism that sowed the seeds of anarchy and ruined the enterprise against the foreigner."

Even the slight sketch given above is sufficient to show by whom those seeds of anarchy were really sown. The poisonous growth of *moderate* corruption spread apace over the Italian soil, and the struggle which Mazzini then began against the internal foes of his country's unity and independence—bitterer far than the previous struggle against her foreign foes—ceased only with his life. The Italian people have gradually fallen away from the energy and virtue of 1848-49. Misled and corrupted by monarchy and its tools, they have abandoned the straight path of honour and dignity upon which Mazzini would have led them, through independence, to social and political freedom; but the one grand primary lesson which his countrymen have learned from his lips—the right and duty of every people to have and to hold the home given to them by God, uncoerced by foreign sway—the sacred love of Italy, the common mother, which he awakened in their hearts, has preserved them alike from the foreign outrage and fratricidal slaughter which have degraded and desolated France. Future generations will reverently treasure up

the religious principles upon which his republican belief was based; to the remote but certain realization of which he dedicated the thought and action of his whole life, and for which he was yet labouring—shattered in health but unshaken in devotion—when released by death in 1872.

CHAPTER V.

ROMAN REPUBLIC—RENEWED INSURRECTIONS—FRANCO-ITALIAN WAR—SICILIAN INSURRECTION—1849 TO 1859.

THE Pope, meanwhile, terrified at the national feeling excited among his own subjects by events in Lombardy and elsewhere, fled from Rome in the disguise of a footman. Rome was free to govern herself; it appeared as if Venice might long hold out; a bloodless revolution had taken place in Tuscany—the Grand Duke had fled—the surrender of Milan had cast discredit upon the monarchy, and Mazzini believed that the utterance of the word Republic by the Roman Assembly, might in that moment of universal fermentation (before Naples had again succumbed to her tyrant) have morally united Italy. The Roman Assembly, however, like prisoners newly released from their fetters, appeared unable to advance. They hesitated, temporized, despatched messengers to the Pope asking instructions, and presented in those first moments of liberty, as Mazzini frankly wrote to them—"a sight half-sorrowful, half-ridiculous. I do not think," he added, "that Providence has ever so plainly declared to a nation—*you shall have no god but God; no interpreter of His law but the people.* . . . Providence has given us for princes a race of fools and traitors, and we persist in striving to regenerate our country through them." . . . He reminded them also that the Pope was a voluntary fugitive, and added that the anxiety he was in as to their first pub-

lic acts, was anxiety for the *unity* of Italy, not for the *republic*, for which he awaited with submission and devotion until the will of all Italy could be solemnly made known. But the Pope's flight was an abdication; he was an *elected* prince, leaving no dynasty behind him; there was therefore no other source of authority in Rome but the people; she was, for the time being, *de facto* a republic, though bound in duty, so soon as the condition of Italy should render it possible, to call together a Constituent Assembly of delegates from every province of Italy, to decide upon the form of Government to be ultimately adopted by the nation.

On the 9th of February 1849, the Roman Parliament, comprehending at length its true dignity and position, proclaimed Rome a republic, and Mazzini having been declared a Roman citizen, and elected a member of the Assembly, hastened to Rome. He passed through Tuscany, and well aware that the Tuscans would not be strong enough to maintain their independence alone, urged upon the Provisional Government the duty of taking the first step towards making Italy one, by uniting Tuscany with Rome. "The people," he says, "with their usual instinct, comprehended the idea at once," and unanimously voted for the republic, and for union with Rome, but the Provisional Government refused to ratify the popular decree. Mazzini then departed for Rome.

He thus speaks of the sensations with which he entered the sacred city, "Rome was the dream of my young years, the generating idea of my mental conception, the keystone of my intellectual edifice, the religion of my soul; and I entered the city, one evening early in March, with a deep sense of awe, almost of worship. Rome was to me, as, in spite of her present degradation, she still is, the temple of humanity. From Rome will

one day spring the religious transformation destined, for the third time, to bestow moral unity upon Europe."

"I had journeyed towards the sacred city with a heart sick unto death from the defeat of Lombardy, the new deceptions I had met with in Tuscany, and the dismemberment of our republican party over the whole of Italy. Yet, nevertheless, as I passed through the *Porta del Popolo* (the Gate of the People), I felt an electric thrill run through me—a spring of new life. I shall never see Rome more, but the memory of her will mingle with my dying thought of God and of my best beloved; and wheresoever fate may lay my bones, I believe they will once more know the thrill that ran through me then, on the day when the Republican banner shall be planted—in pledge of the unity of our Italy—upon the Vatican and Capitol."

Even from the meagre details published in our newspapers at the time, Englishmen know something of the glorious history of that short-lived Republic, which was shamefully stifled in blood by France. It is known that the Roman people, though so long crushed and degraded by the infamous rule of the priests, displayed during the Republic the noblest virtues of citizen-soldiers, animated by the presence among them of one who trusted, respected, and loved them, and was himself the living incarnation of self-sacrifice and devotion.

It is not, however, my purpose to relate that splendid episode in Mazzini's career, which was too brilliant for even calumny to obscure, my aim being to show you the man rather than his work. All men see the light when it is set upon a hill, and I shall therefore pass hastily over the brief but glorious triumph achieved by his principles in action, in order to remove some portion of the darkness which has shrouded the labours of Rome's

exiled triumvir during the gloomy years that have succeeded the fall of his sacred city, and caused her ultimately to be "profaned by monarchy."

Knowing that the first duty of a free state in Italy was to attempt to emancipate the states still groaning under foreign oppression, Mazzini's first care was to prepare for war with Austria. Austria having just triumphantly reconquered Lombardy, he regarded it as inevitable that she would now attack Rome; but "even should Austria not attack us," he says, "it was our duty to make ready to attack her." . . . "We could only win Italy to the Republic by emancipating her from the foreigner—*creating* her . . . by declaring *by acts* to the country—*that which monarchy either could not or would not do, the republic will.* Such was my plan." He therefore proposed to the Assembly to elect a *Committee of War*, to make ready either for defence or offence, as the case might be; and they determined to raise the number of the troops to 45,000, trusting to the assistance of the volunteers, who, as Mazzini rightly foresaw, flocked to Rome from the other parts of Italy. These vigorous preparations for action on the part of the little Republic, compelled King Charles Albert again to attempt to redeem his lost popularity, by declaring war against Austria himself, a war, however, brought to an abrupt end by the shameful battle of Novara, wherein the treachery with which the king's troops were intentionally sacrificed was so apparent, that the king, to appease the popular indignation, chose a remedy much affected by princes, and selecting a scapegoat among the generals, dubbed *him* traitor, and had him shot. Public opinion, however, fixed the shame on a head more near the throne. Charles Albert abdicated immediately after, and his son, Victor Emanuel,

ascended the throne. On the news of this new triumph of Austria, the Roman Assembly, believing war to be imminent, passed a decree investing three citizens with the supreme executive power. Mazzini was the life and soul of this Triumvirate. They had not had one month to organize their forces before Louis Napoleon sent a French army to crush the republic. On the news of the arrival of the French at *Civita Vecchia*, the port of Rome, the Assembly, to their honour, decided to resist. Mazzini's reasons for advising this were many, but chiefly, he says, "one intimately bound up with the aim of my whole life,—the foundation of our national unity. Rome was the natural centre of that unity, and it was important to attract the eyes and the reverence of my countrymen towards her."

But no one, except Mazzini, believed that the Roman people would dare to resist the power of France. Mazzini tells us that, when the question as to whether they should resist or not first arose, the chief officers of the National Guard told him, sadly, that the main body of the guard would refuse to defend the city. "It seemed to me," he says, "that I understood the Roman people far better than they, and I therefore gave orders that all the battalions should defile in front of the Palace of the Assembly on the following morning, in order that the question might be put to the troops. The universal shout of WAR that arose from the ranks, drowned in an instant the timid doubts of the leaders."

Space will not allow me to recount the history of the siege of Rome by the troops of Louis Napoleon. He was at that time President of the French Republic, but "already meditating the enthronement of tyranny at home, he was desirous, on the one hand, of accustoming the soldiery to fight against the republican flag, and on

the other hand, of gaining over the Catholic clergy and that portion of the French people which derived its inspiration from them." And the kings and governments of Europe, dreading the bright example offered to their subjects by the Republic, gladly stood by and allowed the vilest and vulgarest despot among them to bombard the city and restore the self-styled Vicar of the Carpenter's Son to a throne elevated anew upon the corpses of the Roman people and re-cemented with their blood.

After two months siege, during which the Italians performed prodigies of valour, the French made themselves masters of the heights round Rome, and were thus able to destroy the city by means of their artillery. The Assembly declared that resistance being impossible, the defence of the city should be discontinued, and desired the Triumvirate to come to terms with the French General. This Mazzini refused to do, saying, he had been elected a Triumvir "to defend, not to destroy the Republic," and sent in his resignation. His two colleagues followed his example.

He forwarded to them, next day, a noble protest, in order that documentary evidence might remain to prove that "the people had not despaired of their country although the Assembly had done so," saying:—

"You had received a double mandate from God and the people, binding you to resist, so long as resistance was possible, the oppression of the foreigner, and to keep holy the *principle* of which the Assembly was the visible incarnation, by proving to the world that there can be no compact or compromise possible between the just and the unjust; between eternal right and brute force; and that although Monarchies, founded upon the egotism of interest, may yield or capitulate, Republics,

founded upon faith and duty, neither yield nor capitulate, but die protesting."

He pointed out that the people were still eager for the defence, but that the Assembly, by declaring the defence impossible, had in fact, rendered it such by the utterance of that baleful word; reminded them that by allowing the French army to enter Rome, they decreed the fall of the Republic, and added:

"In the supreme and decisive movement, when you should have arisen superior to fate, you were faithless to your mission, and unknowingly betrayed the great Italian idea represented by Rome. . . . . I, as a representative of the people, solemnly protest before you, before the people and before God."

It is characteristic of Mazzini's indifference to personal danger that after the French had entered, he remained more than a week in Rome, wandering about the city with two friends, since dead, and "inwardly thrilling with rage and revolving thoughts of a last struggle of resistance." . . . In those days every faculty of his mind was "absorbed in the one sole thought of rebellion at any cost against the brute force which had thus come down upon us unprovoked, to destroy one republic in the name of another."

All of these plans failing, however, he had yet another reason for remaining. The lies promulgated by the French and Catholic Press, as to the *terror* he had exercised in Rome during the siege, made him desirous of proving the falsity of the accusation by thus offering himself as an easy victim to any who might believe they had an injury to avenge, or feel desirous of being rewarded by the dominating sect. Moreover, he says, "I had not the heart to leave Rome. With a sense within my soul like his who beholds the funeral of his

best-beloved, I witnessed the departure of the members of the Assembly, the Ministers and Government into exile; I saw the hospitals invaded where our wounded lay, suffering far more from the fate of the city than their own; I saw the fresh graves of our bravest trampled and profaned by the foot of the foreign conqueror. . . . How it was that neither the priests nor the French took advantage of the opportunity I thus afforded them of either killing or imprisoning me, is a mystery to me. I remember how —— and —— implored me to leave Rome, and, as they said, preserve myself for better days. But could I have foreseen the new deceptions, the ingratitude, and the abandonment of me by old friends that were in store for me, I should—could I have thought of myself alone—have said to them: *If you love me, let me die with Rome.*"

Mazzini, however, declares with just pride that "the glorious initiative and prophetic page of history inscribed by Rome during that two months' war, will ever remain to prove to men grown wiser than they are at present, all that may be achieved by a *principle* and a nucleus of men firmly resolved to incarnate that principle in action." And after alluding to the miracles of valour, self-sacrifice, order, and discipline displayed in the time of danger by the people—how "the people, the Assembly, and the Triumvirate formed one indivisible whole, each strengthening each by unlimited faith and trust," so that they "*governed without need of tribunals or prisons*," he adds:—

"All these things were due to the Republican institution; to the noble instincts of our people, called out by the existence of a *popular* Government, to the formula of *God and the people*, which awakened in each man's heart a consciousness of his own duty and his own right;

to our faith and trust in the masses, and to their faith and trust in us.* Our monarchy, with 45,000 soldiers and Piedmont as a reserve force, could find no other means of salvation than treachery. And even now, while I write these lines" (1865), "our monarchy, with half a million of men under arms—troops, mobilised national guards, and volunteers—with large pecuniary means and a huge *matériel* of war, with twenty-five millions of Italians wanting Venice—shrinks from assailing the Austrian forces that are encamped upon Italian soil. I know not how well the Romans remember 1849 now. But if Roman mothers have done their duty and taught their children due reverence for the republican martyrs of their city who fell in that year; if they have pointed out to them the spot where fell the young poet of the people, Goffredo Mameli—the spot where Masina, already wounded, and with only nineteen followers, led the charge against a position defended by 300 Frenchmen, and perished—the spot where fell Daverio and Ramorino, refusing to retreat, though but 20 against 100—Villa Corsini—Villa Valentini—il Vascello—Villa Pamfili—the very stones around Rome—each one sanctified by the blood of one who fell with a smile on his face and the republican cry upon his lip—our rising Rome will never, or at least will not long, be profaned by the monarchy."

* Something of the personal affection and trust of the people may be attributed to the fact that the central figure and true soul of the government was as fraternal and democratic in practice as in theory. The little room occupied by the Triumvir in the Quirinal was accessible at all hours to the humblest citizens of Rome. Working men and women entered as freely as the highest officials, and received the same cordial welcome, the same friendly grasp of the hand. The Triumvir dined at a second-class restaurant, for two francs daily, and his only luxury was a bunch of choice flowers, provided for him every day by an unknown hand.

When Mazzini at last left Rome it was without passport or papers of any kind, on a little steamer, commanded by a Corsican who consented to run the risk of conveying him to Marseilles. He contrived to enter and to quit the city and to traverse the enemy's country without detection, and took shelter in Switzerland. Before leaving Rome he had organized a vast secret association in order to maintain a correspondence between the re-enslaved Romans and the national party in the rest of Italy.* This association kept alive the republican spirit of the people for many years, but when the leaders were at last discovered and imprisoned, and their clandestine press seized, Mazzini's last link of communication with Rome was destroyed,—the spell exercised over the people by the authority of his name being broken and the advantage of his counsels lost—agents of the king of Piedmont were sent amongst them to spread false promises of royal help, and advise them to lie quiet and await the great battles of deliverance and independence which the princely deceiver was always going to fight. A people that has consented to lie quiet under slavery, from motives of policy, for a few years, has no need of further counsel to maintain the ignoble attitude, and, whether from sloth or fear, the Romans gradually sank again into the indolence and corruption begotten of slavery; while Mazzini, faithful to his task of teaching his countrymen that, "who would be free himself must strike the blow," was compelled to direct his energies elsewhere.

* The soul of this association was Giuseppe Petroni, of Bologna. His republican constancy and virtue remained unshaken during an imprisonment in the Roman dungeons which lasted nearly twenty years; and he had scarcely regained his freedom before he was engaged, jointly with Mazzini, in the publication of a republican journal, *La Roma del Popolo.*

26590

Before the end of 1852, he had evidence of the result. A conspiracy against the Austrians was discovered in Venetian Lombardy, and notwithstanding the bloody revenge taken by the foe, and the execution of three of the leaders in Mantua, a still more formidable attempt was planned in Milan by a vast secret association formed among the working men. It was not until the conspirators numbered many thousands, and had established links in every town in Lombardy, that they appealed to Mazzini to aid them with arms and money. He dispatched a military man to study their plans and chances of success; which, as the movement had been extremely skilfully planned, and the secret completely kept, he reported to be extremely favourable. Mazzini forwarded assistance in money, but refused to send supplies of arms, on account of the risk of discovery, and reminded the conspirators that resolute men with daggers in their hands could obtain these from the enemy, as they had done in 1848. The hint was taken. The series of *surprises** had been planned and organized with the most wonderful minuteness of detail against all the important points of Milan: the interior of the places to be seized, studied with the most exact precision: each operation was entrusted to a carefully selected and organized group of working men under chosen leaders; each was to take place at a given moment; and throughout all Lombardy every centre of the national party had received instructions for rising as soon as the news should reach them of insurrection

* The word *surprise* is here used in the military sense. In insurrection against a foreign usurping force everything must be secret. Every military man knows that anything and everything *may* be accomplished by *surprises;* but also that the least incident, a noise, an order misinterpreted, or even a delay of a few minutes, &c., may be fatal to their success.

in Milan. A single error and a single betrayal destroyed the whole plan, and caused the discovery of the movement. The error consisted in the agreement made that the execution of all the secondary *surprises* should depend upon a signal to be given by the leader of the initiatory *surprise* of the *Castello*. This leader betrayed his trust, and fled from Milan at the last moment; and the various bands of conspirators who had assembled upon different points of the city, prepared to execute the secondary movements, after awaiting the signal for a certain time, imagined that counter orders had been given by the chiefs, or that discovery had taken place, and dispersed. Two of these bands, however, impatient at the unexplained delay, decided to act alone, and successfully executed the *surprises* of the posts of the *Grande Guardia* and the *Palazzo Reale*, costing the Austrians 150 soldiers and two superior officers. Thirteen Milanese working-men were hanged, without trial, by the Austrian authorities, immediately afterwards. In the midst of the confusion caused by the discovery and the arrests which followed, Mazzini contrived to apprize the majority of the conspirators of the error in time to enable them to escape, and with incredible energy and rapidity, to warn those who were to have led the smaller movements in the lesser cities of Lombardy, of the failure of the attempt.*

It may be well to declare here, once for all, with regard to the many insurrections planned or assisted by Mazzini during his life of incessant struggle and sacrifice, that, without one single exception, he was ever on the spot and took personal part in the danger of every movement initiated by himself, as well as in many of which he had disapproved as immature or injudicious, so

* See Appendix A.

soon as he found that, either from impatience of suffering or miscalculation of the chance of success, his countrymen were determined to risk their lives in the cause of Italy. It is not my intention to insult his memory by answering any of the calumnies spread by the monarchical press of Europe, but for the sake of those who may have listened in ignorance, I assert this fact as the absolute truth; a truth only too well known to those personal friends who, during his life-time were frequently compelled to conceal their knowledge of his peril and speak with outward serenity of the absent beloved one for whom they were trembling at heart. The "small movements" which those who knew nothing of the real condition of Italy, and judged all things by their immediate, and often, only apparent results, were loud to condemn—were invariably determined by the solemn conviction in the mind of the man, which had flashed by heroic intuition across the mind of the boy in the streets of Genoa—the conviction that against an existing wrong in one's own country, resistance is a duty: the belief that the Italians *could* and therefore *ought* to struggle for freedom, and the perception which grew and strengthened with his growth, that success was possible if all would do their duty, and that they were therefore bound to renew the attempt whensoever there appeared a reasonable chance of success. He never forgot that even failure in the attempt to free their country was a grand step in the education of the Italian people, as well as a breach made in the citadel of oppression.

The Italian people were so full of hatred to their foreign masters, that even after this failure and the arrests, executions and persecutions which followed—Mazzini had proceeded far in preparations for renewed action before the end of 1854, when his plans were

overthrown in the south by the dispatch of French and English vessels of war to Naples, and in the centre, by the treachery of some agents of the Piedmontese monarchy who had pretended to join the conspiracy. The ceaseless persecution of Mazzini by the Piedmontese king, arose from the fact of his preaching to the people that they who were free from foreign rule themselves, were doubly bound to free the remainder of Italy from bondage; that duties were in proportion to means; and that Piedmont, having means, was bound to use them for the benefit of the common country, or unworthy to possess them. But the "fatherland of kings is their own family;" the interests of Victor Emmanuel were linked with those of the despots of Europe, and he was not disposed to perform a duty which might irritate his royal "cousins," nor to allow his people to act for themselves and make the dangerous discovery of their own strength. Consequently, while monarchical agents were encouraged, and even paid to preach to the people the easier doctrine of "each for himself," Mazzini, in preaching the less attractive lesson of duty, had to contend against the perpetual difficulty of the sequestration of his writings, freedom of the press* being practically unknown in Piedmont. In order to meet this difficulty, he published a journal called "Thought and Action," first in London, and then in Switzerland.

The attempt upon Naples, headed by Mazzini's

* The "Italia e Popolo," the organ of the liberal party, was sequestrated *fifty* times between February and September of that year, and no less than four editors of the paper imprisoned. The spirit in which the government prosecutions were carried on, may by inferred from the fact that on one occasion, when a journalist who had already endured two months' *preventive* imprisonment was acquitted, the advocate for the crown angrily exclaimed: "*you may acquit him; but God himself can't undo the two months' imprisonment he has suffered already.*"

friend, Carlo Pisacane, and the simultaneous rising in Genoa and Leghorn in 1857, were the next public revelation of the results of Mazzini's untiring apostolate. Pisacane seized upon the *Cagliari* steamer, freed the political prisoners in the island of Ponza, and landed with them on the Neapolitan shore, with the intention of co-operating with certain members of the national party there against the Bourbon tyrant; and the insurgents of Genoa and Leghorn attempted to take possession of the arms and *matériel* of their well-filled arsenals therewith to aid the movement in the south. "The question," said Mazzini, in a defence of the attempt* published shortly after in refutation of the calumnies spread by the Moderate press, "was not between the Republic and Royalty, but between action and inertness. I am a republican, and such are almost all those who support me in a struggle which has now lasted for five-and-twenty years . . . . but we maintain that no one has the right to substitute his own will, or that of his section, for the national will." He and his followers refused to recognise in Piedmont other than the freest portion of Italy, and, consequently, the part most bound by duty towards the rest. Upon the map of Europe they recognised not Piedmont, Tuscany, Naples, &c., but only *Italy*. Whosoever rejected that programme might be a Piedmontese, Tuscan, or Neapolitan, but he was not an Italian. Genoa was free from foreign rule; by the laws of God and man, duties were in proportion to means; Genoa had means, and was bound to use them, or unworthy to be free. But, in Mazzini's sense of the word, the Moderates were not

* A translation of this defence, entitled "The late Genoese Insurrection defended," was published by Mr Joseph Cowen, of Newcastle, in 1858.

Italians—"the duality between the prosperous and the wretched, under the names of Piedmont and Italy, had taken hold of their minds . . . . the lesser country had made them forget the great, the true country—Italy." To the monarchical agents and journalists who incessantly preached to the Piedmontese people to be content with *offering the example of constitutional government* to the provinces under despotic rule, he exclaimed:—

"Speak not of example! To whom? To the men upon whose head is placed the *cap of silence?** To the men who, hemmed in by foreign bayonets, are forbidden to meet together by five at a time . . . to counsel each other through the press? . . . It is the example of the man who bars his own door when murder is doing without. . . . Act, in God's name, and we will follow you; if not, we will act ourselves, and drag you into the arena in search of that *opportunity* you pretend to await."

Nor was it without reason that he spoke thus. Piedmont had been free for ten years, and although possessed of a well-organized army and navy, and well-filled treasury and arsenals, had won no inch of ground from the foreign rulers of Italy. The Moderates sought to stifle the good instincts of the people by telling them that every attempt on their part interfered with the "vaster designs gradually being matured by the monarchy," so that, little by little, "the credulity of the uneducated, the prestige exercised by even a phantom of force, . . . the conscious or unconscious selfishness of the comfort-seekers in life, had created," says Mazzini, "a population of dupes, who persisted in committing the salvation of Italy to protocols which recognised the dominion of Austria in Lombardy; to the propositions

* A method of torture then in use in the prisons of Naples.

of Ministerial *Liberators*,* who teach their masters how to *prevent* the unity of Italy; to wars in the Crimea, seeking the co-operation of Austria; to Anglo-French mediations which demand—but do not obtain—the liberation of a few prisoners; to the occult designs of the man who, having extinguished in blood the liberties of France and Rome, is doomed, by an inexorable fate, to live and die a tyrant."

The heroic attempt of Pisacane upon Naples was crushed. He himself fell in a desperate hand-to-hand fight against overwhelming numbers,† and the few of his little band who were taken alive, were cast into the hideous Neapolitan dungeons. The movement in Genoa in support of his expedition was put down by the Piedmontese monarchy; that in Leghorn by the Austrian Grand Duke. Both of these movements having been prepared by Mazzini, the Moderates misrepresented their purpose, declaring the attempt had been intended to overthrow the Piedmontese monarchy and establish a republic. Their journals vied with one another in calumnies against Mazzini, and groans over his "fatal influence" upon the people.

"For six-and-twenty years," wrote he, in answer, "if I am to believe you, I have been fatal to the Italian cause. . . . I have committed nothing but errors; nay, many times have I been declared utterly extinguished, null, unworthy of being spoken about; yet, nevertheless, I grown grey in years and care, my means exhausted, opposed by all the governments, gendarmes, and spies of Europe, so that—England only excepted—there is not

* The Moderates were at that period coining medals to Cavour as the "Liberator" of Italy.

† The agents of the Neapolitan Government persuaded the villagers at Sapri, where he landed, that he and his men were escaped banditti, and by this deception obtained their assistance against them

therein an inch of ground I can tread legally and without danger, from time to time I reappear, an agitator, followed, you can no longer say by a few, and feared by the powers who are strong in public and secret organisation, in their armies, their gold, and some of them even—if their press speak true—in opinion. Why is this? I will tell you. . . . I am but a voice crying, Action: but the state of Italy cries for action; the best men of Italy cry for action; the people of her cities . . . cry for action; the scourge and the *cap of silence* at Naples point to action; the glorious memories of '48, and the unspeakable shame of the people to whom these memories belong, and whose teachers lead it—the Belisarius of liberty—to beg from the protocols of every conference, from the memoranda of all semi-liberal ministers, a deceitful hope of *ameliorations*—call for action as a solemn duty. . . . So long as you offer to remedy the ills of Italy by sleeping draughts, immobility, and . . . *opportunities*, the souls who thirst for action will turn to me . . . to us, who when asked by the south of Italy . . . to send a steamer to Ponza, found means to send one, while you gave nothing but words and pity. Do you wish to destroy my fatal influence? Act; act better and more efficaciously than I. When I—left alone by you—act on what you call a small scale, unite and act upon a larger scale. . . . You also are Italians . . . Agitate Piedmont till she awaken to a sense of her duty. . . . Give money and muskets to your brothers in the south, the centre, and the north."

The king answered by condemning him to death: the king's minister, Cavour, by declaring in Parliament "the monarchy of Piedmont exists in virtue of treaties *which it respects.*" *

* Treaties which guaranteed Lombardy to Austria, Tuscany to Leopold of Austria, Rome to the Pope, and Naples to the Bourbons.

It were well if the peoples would bear in mind that all the monarchies in Europe exist upon the same terms —"respect" for the treaties and alliances framed in the self-interest of despots.

The Moderates continued their system of decrying all present action in the name of imaginary action to come, coining medals, meanwhile, to Cavour, as the *Liberator of Italy*, in spite of his repeated and public assertion that the emancipation and unity of Italy was a "Utopian dream." Mazzini, meanwhile, unshaken as ever by failure, continued calmly re-weaving the broken web of the national party, and endeavouring, through his vast correspondence and his public writings, to *Italianize* Piedmont and prepare the way for action. In order to counteract his "fatal influence," Cavour formed a so-called "national society," the ostensible purpose of which was to prepare for war with Austria. This talk of war brought over the majority, even of the republicans, to the monarchy once more; and as soon as the rumour of an alliance with France was heard, Victor Emmanuel and Cavour were loudly proclaimed by the Moderates "the *unificators* of Italy," and thoughtlessly accepted as such by the people, who flocked from every province of Italy to enrol themselves beneath the royal standard,—the princes of the centre abandoning their thrones in terror, as before.

The purpose of Cavour, in declaring war against Austria, was twofold. It was necessary to checkmate Mazzini,—the revival of whose influence might again endanger the throne by leading the people to fight their own battle under republican leadership,—by assuring them (as in the case of Charles Albert in '48) that the king would spare them fresh sacrifices by conquering for them; and at the same time to win for his master the long-coveted,

rich province of Lombardy.* The French Emperor, finding it necessary to amuse the discontent of both army and people by the silly bait of military glory, availed himself of Cavour's uneasiness at the revival of national feeling in Italy, but, with truly princely greed, the plebeian Emperor required from him a secret treaty, binding Victor Emmanuel to hand over to France the two frontier provinces of Nizza and Savoy in exchange, a proceeding which a single glance at the map of Italy will show to have been about as wise as that of the householder who drives a robber from his field by the help of a burglar, and hands to him the keys of his front and back doors as a reward. Three things are notable with regard to this treaty: the indifference with which that Royal Esau, Victor Emanuel, sold his Savoyard birthright for the Lombard pottage; the fact that, as usual in monarchical arrangements, the feelings and wishes of the populations transferred from one ruler to another were reckoned of no account, and the folly with which the ever deluded people hailed Louis Napoleon as their disinterested friend and "magnanimous ally." In vain did Mazzini, who knew the truth, endeavour to recall the Italians to their senses by publishing, *six months before the event*,† the secret conditions of the agreement entered into between Cavour and Napoleon as to the *price to be paid* to the magnanimous ally for the execution of an "idea," which was quite other than the idea of the Italian people. "Napoleon," he wrote, "seeks Nizza and Savoy (*the price stipulated for Lombardy*), the throne of the Naples for Murat, and of the Centre for his cousin. . . . *Cavour has agreed*

* The reader will remember the "precedent" created by the act of *fusion* in 1848.

† On the 15th December 1858.

to these things. . . . If Austria resist to the utmost the whole design will be completed. If, after the first defeats, she should offer to abandon Lombardy, in order to have Venetia secured to her, *they will accept,* and *only the conditions concerning the aggrandisement of the House of Savoy* will *be fulfilled;* the rest of uprisen Italy will be abandoned to the vengeance of her masters."* He foretold also a "sudden ruinous peace, fatal to the insurgents, before the war is half over. . . . Louis Napoleon, fearing the action of the peoples, should the war be prolonged, will compel the Sardinian monarchy to desist, *conceding to it a certain portion of territory, according to circumstances, and abandoning the betrayed Venetian provinces, as well as a portion of Lombardy, to Austria."* †

The people, however, dazzled by the Emperor's proclamation, that Italy should be "freed from the Alps to the sea," forgot that he had strangled liberty in France; forgot that his bayonets still propped the rotten throne of the Pope; forgot Victor Emanuel's share in the former betrayal of Milan, and the treachery of Novara; forgot, in short, the truth bluntly and forcibly stated by one of the wisest and noblest men of the national party,‡ that "he never reaches heaven who travels arm in arm with the devil." Volunteers continued to flock to the king's standard, notwithstanding the appeals made to them by the moderate press, *not to embarrass the Government,* as the regular troops were more than sufficient to complete the emancipation of Italy. Though neglected and discouraged in every possible manner, they still poured in, until when more than 60,000 had thus *embarrassed*

* See his journal, "Thought and Action" (Pensiero e Azione). Trübner, London. Lausanne, Switz.

† Thought and Action. ‡ Quadrio.

the Government, 4,000 were unwillingly accepted and enrolled under Garibaldi;* the rest were rejected by the "Sword of Italy," as the Moderates persistently named the vulgar licentious prince who had never struck a blow in her cause.

The facts of the war are well known. The allied troops gained victory after victory, and, when the defeat of Solferino had rendered Austria for the time helpless, and Lombardy was won back to Italy, the emancipation of all Italy appeared, as, if the war had been carried on it would have been, certain. But "the sudden and ruinous peace" which Mazzini had predicted, gave the lie to the hopes of the people; it was even more ruinous both to the honour and security of Italy than he had foretold, for the proposals which, according to the secret treaty, were to be accepted, *if offered by Austria,* were imposed by the French Emperor himself. "Peace is concluded between the Emperor of Austria and myself," said the "magnanimous ally;" the puppet king was not so much as named in the matter; the four fortresses which divided Venetian Lombardy from Lower Lombardy were left in the hands of Austria; Venice was secured to her; the Dukes of Modena and Tuscany were declared restored to their rights; Bologna given back to the Pope, and an Italian Confederation announced, with the Pope for its head. The proclamations of Napoleon had declared

* The young men least fitted for warfare were selected to serve under Garibaldi, who named them "the invalides." The remainder were either despatched to distant military depôts, or distributed among the stationary regiments. The reason was obvious: these young volunteers represented not only the warlike, but the revolutionary element of their native provinces; and although, had they been drilled and organized, they might have done admirable service by harassing the rear of the Austrian army, which was allowed to retreat unmolested after the defeat at Magenta, they might also, if united in arms, have kindled an insurrection on the occasion of the shameful peace which followed.

that the Italian people should be "free to express their legitimate desires." Bologna and Tuscany refused to accept their former masters, and the first impulse of the populations, indignant at the shameful conclusion of the war, was to separate the Centre from the rest of Italy; and many of the republicans favoured this idea, and rashly turned against Mazzini,—who earnestly preached the duty of uniting those provinces with Piedmont,—accusing him of "prostrating his faith at the feet of the king," while the federalists (fortunately for Italy a party as insignificant as unscrupulous), declared that his writings, by teaching the people to seek the unity of their country before every other good, had prepared the way for the servile worship of monarchy, which, at that time, degraded Italy. The monarchical press meanwhile declared this revival of republican hostility to be his work, and accused him of conspiring to overthrow the monarchy. Equally unmoved by abuse and calumny, he continued to preach unity as the first necessity for the Italian people, because only a strong and united nation could maintain that independence from foreign rule for which they had taken up arms, or sustain a republic, should the united nation determine upon that form of government. It is known that, owing to the instinct of unity which he had awakened in the people, the plans both of Louis Napoleon and the Separatists were defeated. Bologna and Tuscany persisted in offering themselves to Piedmont. In pursuance of his idea of enthroning his cousin in Tuscany, Napoleon ordered Cavour to decline the gift, and was meanly obeyed, but the anti-French manifestations made on the visit of the Emperor's cousin, were so unequivocal, that the scheme was of necessity abandoned. Bologna and Tuscany maintained their independence, and ultimately the king was allowed

to accept what could no longer be withheld, and these new gems for his crown were, like the rest of his "greatness," *thrust upon him.*

Mazzini's whole energies were now directed to the one idea of carrying on and *Italianizing* the war. He implored all parties to set aside every internal question for this great aim. "In the name of the honour of Italy," said he, "let us all make One." He addressed a magnificent letter to the king, pointing out to him that the war had but begun, and assuring him that if he would put himself at the head of the nation to unite Italy, the republicans would loyally support and aid him in the enterprise. "All parties would then be extinguished," said he; "the only things left in Italy would be the people and yourself."

The excitement produced by this letter was such that it became impossible for the king to ignore it. The popularity of Cavour had been shaken by the ignominious peace, and the Ratazzi ministry, which succeeded, was compelled to coquette with the war party, to caress Garibaldi, and to feign sympathy with the popular wish. Brofferio, the celebrated historian of Piedmont, carried Mazzini's letter to the king, who informed him that he had already read it; declared himself determined that "Italy should exist at any cost," and desired Brofferio to offer Mazzini an interview.

Mazzini answered that it was as well to speak clearly on both sides before meeting; that, convinced that the majority desired Victor Emmanuel for their king, he, bowing to the will of the nation, assured him that if he would sincerely endeavour to become such by winning the still enslaved provinces to the crown, he would help him to the utmost; but the king must promise not to sheath his sword until he were victorious:—

"I cannot," said Mazzini, "accept '*union*' or 'progressive unification,' . . . no such compromise. I will not accept the offer to fight to-day for the Duchies; to-morrow for some other portion of Italy; then to wait till the Pope die for another; then wait two or three years for war for Venice. . . . The fact of the day is the revolution in the centre. *There* must be the fulcrum of the lever. The king must openly make common cause with the centre, and unite it to Italy: if not, not. My proposal is based on the conviction that Piedmont and the Italian revolution are strong enough for the enterprise. To revolutionize the south is easy;* and that done, with the actual Neapolitan army, the troops of Sicily, those already in arms in Piedmont, Lombardy, and the centre, and those which such a fact would create in Italy, the king would have 500,000 men and a marine. If the monarchy has amongst its servants no man who understands these things, all action in common is impossible: each of us must do what he can alone. . . . The enterprise in the south is easy: I do not even ask Piedmont to initiate it—we will do that."

He added that if the king really desired unity, he should send word to the small governments† in the centre to cease their persecution and imprisonment of

* Facts showed the truth of this a few months later.

† The "governments" here alluded to were the temporary governments formed in the Dukedoms of the Centre and in those portions of the Papal States wherein the populations had thrown off the yoke of their former masters, and offered themselves to the Piedmontese crown. Such were the (Bonapartist) dictatorship of Cipriani, in Bologna, succeeded by that of Farini, which extended over the Romagne, Modena and Parma, and that of Ricasoli, in Tuscany. The two last were creatures of the king of Piedmont, and ruled in his interests until he—himself the creature of Louis Napoleon—was allowed to accede to the wishes of the populations, and unite those provinces to the rest of Italy.

Italian exiles, and let Garibaldi know (directly or indirectly) that should he pass the fictitious frontier between the Roman States and Naples, he would be tacitly approved by the Government, and (should Austria intervene against him) have its open support. Should the king loyally accept these propositions, Mazzini promised to maintain absolute secrecy upon the matter. He added that the insurrection of Sicily was certain as soon as Garibaldi should pass the frontier on his way to Naples, but that should the king prefer it, he would undertake to secure that insurrection beforehand, so as to give Garibaldi an ostensible reason for his passing. "As soon as Garibaldi reaches the Abruzzi," he added, "the insurrection of Naples itself is certain; certain, also, the offer of annexation to Piedmont (if the National party have instructions not to oppose it), *which offer the king must accept at once.*" Piedmont might thus make all Italy her own, and "the king become the man of the century." He concluded by saying, "if the king agrees to these propositions, we can arrange matters together at once; if not, all interviews are needless, as in that case, I am irrevocably determined to maintain my own independence."

He who wrote thus was under sentence of death, and obliged to remain concealed in the dominions of the king with whom he made these stipulations, a fact which is alone sufficient to prove (if any such were needed) that it was the "fatal influence" of his character and genius that impelled the halting advance of the *Sword of Italy* upon that path of Italian unity upon which he was to reap the fruits. While he was thus hesitating, lacking the courage to dare, Cavour returned to power and commenced plotting with "Bomba" of Naples, and the "magnanimous ally," that division of Italy

into three, of which I have spoken above, and all contact with Mazzini was broken off.

It had been found impossible openly to outrage the warlike sentiment of the people by disbanding Garibaldi's brigade, and the fact that it remained in arms kept alive the hopes of the credulous in the intentions of the king. Mazzini, who knew better what these intentions were, now urged upon Garibaldi himself the scheme he had suggested to the monarch, hoping either to compel Victor Emmanuel to follow lead as before, or to induce the people to act without him. Many, even of the Moderates, favoured the idea of the insurrection and invasion of the south, but on condition that Mazzini, who had planned the movement, should not appear in the matter, declaring that his name was so identified with republicanism, that it would ensure the hostile intervention of Napoleon. Always indifferent to things personal, Mazzini wrote to Garibaldi detailing to him the preparations already made in the south, and urging him to put himself at the head of the movement, promising, should it be successful, to conceal the fact that it was his own work, and to leave the whole glory and credit to Garibaldi; while, on the other hand, he offered, in case of failure, to bear all the obloquy and discredit himself, and allow the expedition to be declared "a Mazzinian dream." Garibaldi agreed to this proposal in writing. Unhappily, notwithstanding his promise of secrecy, he privately informed the king of the plan, and the monarch, with his usual cunning, feigned approval. The general had already given the order to march on the ensuing day, when, on the receipt of a private telegram from the king, he abruptly broke faith with Mazzini and his own troops, and quitted the camp by night. His two

colonels (Medici and Cosenz) were shortly afterwards raised to the rank of generals in the regular army.

As unshaken by Garibaldi's betrayal as he had ever been by the opposition of princes and the instability and ingratitude of the people, Mazzini persevered in his endeavour to lead his countrymen to their duty. Those who knew him intimately perceived a deeper sadness in his smile after every such wrong or delusion; but there was no other change in him. His agents had long traversed the south, and knowing Sicily to be more disposed to begin the struggle for freedom than Naples, he decided to send Rosalino Pilo, a young Sicilian nobleman, who had been educated to republican virtue by him, and whom he deeply loved, to head the insurrection there. Rosalino and Quadrio, a republican second to none in untiring self-abnegation and devotion to his country, had previously used every effort to persuade Garibaldi to head the expedition, but were scornfully refused, and told that the promised insurrection of the south was "a Mazzinian dream." At length, informed by Rosalino that it was his fixed resolution to act, with or without him, the general promised that should Pilo so far succeed as to be able to hold out for eight days, he would join the movement. The young republican started at once, his sole material of war being a few thousand francs, and some pistols furnished by Mazzini. He knew his Sicilian countrymen well; they had promised to act, and they would keep their word.

It had been agreed upon that the insurrection Pilo had undertaken to lead should begin at Palermo on the 3d of April, and although he was detained by stress of weather till the 11th, the people rose on the appointed day. On his arrival, he found that the movement had

been suppressed in the city, but that the country-people were still in arms. He at once took the command, re-awakened the enthusiasm of the people, beat the royal troops in every encounter, maintained the insurrection in growing power and vigour against an enormous disparity of numbers,—not only for eight days, but for six weeks—and fell by a gunshot wound, in the moment of victory. He had beaten the troops of King Bomba in a decisive encounter, and died with a smile in his face, having, in that instant, received the news that Garibaldi had landed.

CHAPTER VI.

NEAPOLITAN REVOLUTION—ROYAL INTRIGUES—APPEAL FOR VENICE—NEW ROYAL INTRIGUES—WAR WITH AUSTRIA—MENTANA—LETTERS BY MAZZINI—BETRAYAL—GAETA—MAZZINI'S DEATH.

CAVOUR and the Moderates had openly blamed the insurrection of Sicily; they opposed, as long as it was possible to do so, Garibaldi's departure to aid Rosalino Pilo, and even when the General and his "thousand" had reached the island, they used every effort to induce him to promise not to cross over to Naples. It is said that the king even wrote to him an autograph letter to that effect. But circumstances were too strong for them, and when, after a series of victories in Sicily, Garibaldi crossed to the Neapolitan shore, King Bomba fled in terror at his mere name, and he entered the metropolis of the south, amid the acclamations of the people, her conqueror, before he had struck a blow for her liberation.

The Moderates then changed their tactics, and gave out that the whole movement had been secretly prepared by Cavour* with the approval of the king, and they dispatched agents to Naples to prepare the way for the annexation of the kingdom to the Piedmontese throne.

* Garibaldi himself, however, in his published writings, has not only strongly denied having ever received any assistance from the monarchical party, but has even accused them of putting every possible obstacle in his way. See his "Letter to the Sardinian Electors" (*Unità Italiana*, No. 10, 1869), wherein the charges made against the king's ministers are explicit and terrible. He does not name the king, but there is an Italian proverb which says, *he flogs the saddle who dares not flog the horse.*

Mazzini, in the meantime, still secreted in Italy, was ceaselessly at work preparing arms, ammunition, and men to help the revolution. But loving the whole of Italy with equal love, he thought not only of Naples, but of Venetia, the Trentino, and the States of the Pope. He believed that the completion of the freedom of the south might be safely left to the awakened enthusiasm of the population, guided by the prestige and power of Garibaldi and his volunteers, and therefore intended the three expeditions which, with the help of a Committee of War which he had formed in Genoa, he had successively fitted out, to carry help into the Papal States; but, partly owing to the obstacles placed in his way by the Government, and partly to the fact that the volunteers themselves were more eager to join the popular hero than to try the chances of a new movement without him, Mazzini was thrice compelled reluctantly to dispatch all the men and material collected, to the south. Having thus, "without assistance from the Government, and appealing only to the patriotism of Italian men and women, rapidly dispatched arms, steamers, and upwards of 20,000 men to Garibaldi," he recommenced his labours for a fourth time, and equipped and officered a body of 8000 men to enter the Roman States, where the population, although unarmed, was prepared to support their entry by rising in insurrection.

Garibaldi, whom the enthusiastic Neapolitans had proclaimed Dictator, approved the plan, and as the most solemn promises had been exacted from the military leaders that the republican banner should not be raised, the most influential men of the Moderate party, the authorities of Tuscany and Genoa, the Minister of the Interior, and the king himself, with whom one of

the military leaders had a long interview, consented. The success of the movement, against the ill-organised army commanded by the Pope's General (Lamoricière), (an army which was a sort of loosely pieced mosaic of fanatics from every country in Europe,) appeared certain. Mazzini's plan was, as soon as these should be beaten and the Pope should have fled as before, to leave the Romans to maintain their newly acquired freedom, while Garibaldi should join the victorious volunteers and push on with them to free Venice.

The king agreed to everything, but two hours later sent an autograph letter, *to be shown not given*, to the military leaders and authorities, forbidding the movement. The Governor of Tuscany,* who had allowed the volunteers to be publicly recruited and trained to arms within a few miles of Florence, suddenly interfered on the day before their departure, and turning the cannon of the royal troops upon them, compelled them to embark for Naples, where the successes of Garibaldi having rendered it impossible to frustrate the popular movement, the king had determined to profit by it, and had, to that end, sent his generals, Medici, Bixio, and Cosenz, to take the direction of the war into their own hands. The policy of Victor Emanuel was, as Mazzini publicly declared at the time, "always to endeavour to prevent any and every popular *movement*, but always to turn every popular *victory* to account, for the enlargement of his own dominions."

Ricasoli afterwards defended his treachery by declaring that he had information that Mazzini's real purpose in arming the volunteers was, not to free the Roman States, but to commence a republican revolution.

"Let *us* act," wrote Mazzini in a public letter to

* Ricasoli.

the monarchists: "what is it you fear? a Republic?—no! we have told you that should we ever again deem it a duty to conspire for the republic, we will give you full warning. A struggle for office? no! you well know that, were Italy once united under a monarchy, we should return into voluntary exile. That we should seek to share the glory? no! you know that we have always worked in darkness, concealing even our names. But," he concluded, "if you will persist in taking orders from Louis Napoleon, then hear our determination—

"We will never yield.

"We are strong and resolved . . . . The instinct of the people is with us; if you put us down in one place, we will rise again in another. We will have One, united Italy. Will you unite her? If so, we will stand by you: if not, we will stand by Italy and our own fixed resolution. You may sequestrate our writings: you will be cowardly enough to sequestrate *this*. We will then teach the people their duty through the clandestine press. You may imprison us: others will rise up and take our place. When the time is ripe for the fulfilment of a mission, God raises up from the prison or the grave of one leader, another stronger than he. We will have our country. You cannot prevent that which is willed by God and the people."

The insurrectionary movement commenced in the Roman States, and the brutalities committed in Perugia and elsewhere by the mercenary troops of Lamoricière, created a ferment in Italy which alarmed the king; Garibaldi still held in his hands the whole resources of the late kingdom of Naples; the cry of the betrayed populations and the appeals made to him by all the true patriots of Italy, decided him to employ the vast resources at his command in aid of his oppressed

fellow-countrymen, and he issued a proclamation announcing his immediate intention of marching upon Rome. This announcement determined the Government to act. It became clear that the king must either take possession of the insurgent provinces himself, or see them freed by the people. The Moderate press seized the occasion to magnify the Italian tendencies of the king, but he, as his father had done in '48, was careful to assure the other crowned heads of Europe of his real motives. The press of Europe vied with the Moderates of Italy in admiration of the daring "Sword of Italy," but it was the courage of fear. "*If we are not in the Cattolica before Garibaldi,*" said Cavour to the French Minister (Talleyrand), "*we are lost. The revolution will invade Central Italy. We are constrained to act.*"* And the circular of the French Minister (Thouvenel) declares—

'"*Signor Farini . . . has explained to the Emperor* (in Chambéry) *the extremely dangerous and embarrassing position in which the triumph of the revolution, personified to some extent by Garibaldi, threatened to place the Government of his Sardinian Majesty. . . . Garibaldi was about to pass freely across the Roman States, raising the populations, and having passed that frontier, it would have been impossible* TO PREVENT AN ATTACK UPON VENICE" (Mazzini's plan). "*There was but one course left to the Cabinet of Turin by which to prevent these events, which was to enter the Marche and Umbria so soon as the arrival of Garibaldi had awakened disturbance, and* RESTORE ORDER, *without touching the authority of the Pope, and, if necessary,* TO GIVE BATTLE TO THE REVOLUTION

* Despatch of the 10th September 1860.—*Documents of the French Official Collection* (Paris).

*on the Neapolitan territory, and immediately call together a congress to settle the condition of Italy."**

Mazzini knew these things, and wrote to Garibaldi† at the time, saying:—"*If you are not on your way towards Rome or Venice before three weeks are over, your initiative will be at an end.*" He left Tuscany, and hastened to Naples, but his efforts were vain. Garibaldi's initiative was already practically at an end; he was surrounded by the king's party, who excited the ignorant population against Mazzini by declaring that the idea of the deliverance of Rome from the Pope was a mere blind, and that he was, in fact, conspiring to overthrow the Dictatorship and establish a Republic, which would bring upon them the intervention of all the monarchs of Europe, to restore Bomba to the throne, etc., etc. One distinguished member of the monarchical party,‡ a man respected by the Neapolitans, because he had in former years rebelled against their dethroned tyrant, chose a more wily method of attack. He addressed a letter to Mazzini through the press, acquitting him of all evil intentions, but assuring him that his name was so associated with republicanism, that his mere presence among them was a source of anarchy and danger, and appealing to

* Circular Thouvenel, 18th October 1860.—*Documents of the French Official Collection* (Paris).

† It may be added that many other well-known Italian patriots (Quadrio, Cattaneo, Saffi, Bertani, &c.) also vainly endeavoured to induce Garibaldi to carry on the national enterprise at that time, instead of abandoning all things to the monarchists; and it is possible that he might have listened to their advice, had it not been for his constant, insurmountable objection to the idea of associating himself in action with Mazzini, at the risk of being overshadowed by his potent individuality and genius. "I will act alone—I will not see Mazzini," he repeated, even as late as 1869, to a young Piedmontese patriot, one of at least a hundred messengers sent to him to propose an interview.

‡ Giorgio Pallavicini.

him to prove his patriotism by withdrawing into voluntary exile for his country's good. The peculiar meanness of this appeal consisted in the fact, that while professing to address itself to Mazzini, it was, in effect, an appeal to the authorities to drive him out of Italy. The decrees by which Mazzini had been condemned to death in every state of Italy, had never been revoked, and it was simply in consequence of the overthrow of the king of Naples, that he was able to show himself by daylight in that portion of his native land. He, however, answered Pallavicini, refusing to leave Naples, and saying,—". . . The greatest sacrifice it was possible for me to make, I made, from love of unity and civil concord, when, ceasing from all apostolate of my own faith, I declared that I accepted monarchy, not from reverence for either monarch or ministers, but from reverence for the will of the majority of the Italian people (no matter how deluded), and was even ready to co-operate with it, so long as it should further the foundation of Italian unity, adding that should I at any time believe myself bound in conscience again to raise our old banner, I would frankly and publicly declare my intention to friends and foes. I will not voluntarily make any other. If honest men, like yourself, believe my word, it is their duty to strive to convince, not me, but my enemies, that their own intolerance is the only source of anarchy actually existing. If they do not believe a man who for thirty years has sought only his country's good; who was the first to teach his present accusers to lisp the name of unity, and who has never lied to any living soul,—so be it with them." *

* A few months later, in answer to an address full of honour and reverence, sent to him by his Genoese fellow-citizens, he wrote from

Having thus answered Pallavicini, Mazzini calmly pursued his life-long course, doing his duty, and leaving the rest to God. He saw "*Death to Mazzini*" written upon the walls, and smiled. He felt no bitterness towards the people, knowing that the responsibility of their ignorant injustice lay not with them, and he persisted in publicly repeating to their rulers the truth that duties are in proportion to means; that Naples, being strong and free, was bound to use her freedom for good, by helping the still enslaved provinces of Italy, where the royal troops would only "restore order without touching the authority of the Pope," and that Garibaldi, whom the people had chosen as leader, was bound to lead them to Rome, and to proclaim religious liberty in the focus of religious despotism. His genius and eloquence produced their usual effect; sincere lovers of Italy took heed of the truths thus fearlessly uttered; several journals were started supporting his views, his room was nightly crowded with volunteers eager to put them in practice, when Garibaldi, who, by availing himself in that moment of the people's love and trust in him, and leading the army, navy, and volunteers to the deliverance of Rome, might have united Italy—suddenly blighted the hopes of all enlightened patriots, and postponed the advent of religious liberty in Italy for an indefinite period, by presenting the Neapolitan provinces to King Victor Emanuel. Having performed this piece of idle dramatic display, Garibaldi

a sick bed, bidding them forget individuals and think only of their country, of rendering her free and worthy of the noble part he believed her destined to play in the drama of the future. "God," he said, "has offered to you the grand mission of creating the Europe of the nationalities. Would that I might die in exile, would that even the memory of my name might perish within your hearts, so might I but dying, hail you, oh my brothers, on the path towards its fulfilment!"

retired to the island of Caprera, lauded and exalted as "the modern Cincinatus" by the venal monarchical press of Europe, forgetful of or indifferent to the fact that the rich Neapolitan provinces were an integral portion of Italy, and consequently the property of the Italian nation, and disposing of a population of nine millions of human beings, as if they had been the cattle on his personal estate. His admirers have urged in his excuse that Victor Emanuel had privately assured him that he would himself lead the army to Rome, and it is agreeable to hope that he was really so unmindful of the past as to be able to believe this. Mazzini, seeing that all hope was for the time at an end, departed, without witnessing the public entry of the King to take possession of a gift which the fortunate soldier had no right to bestow.

The instincts of the Italian people are eminently noble and true; their heroic response to Mazzini when he was no longer a voice crying in the wilderness, but a living and inspiring presence among them at Rome, is sufficient proof of this. But they had been corrupted by long ages of servitude, and the dawn of freedom found them—like men long chained in a dungeon—dazzled and bewildered by the light, and feeble and uncertain whither to direct their steps. Consequently, they were easily led to trust to the first semblance of a Force among them, and to leave the performance of their duty to others. The seventeen years propaganda of *Young Italy* had produced the magnificent outburst of national feeling in 1848, but it had been easier to awaken within them the instinct of unity, and the indignant sense of their *right* to Rome, Venice, and the Trentino, than to inspire them with the constancy and resolution to win their right for themselves.

Nevertheless, as time went on, and it gradually became clear that Victor Emanuel had no real intention of undertaking the national duty, the Italians, seeing themselves again deluded in their trust in Princes, remembered the man who had bidden them trust only in "God and the People." Demonstrations and *émeutes* recommenced in all the chief towns in Italy in 1861, and the population of Turin, then the capital of Victor Emanuel's kingdom, assumed so threatening an attitude, that the venal and servile Parliament found it necessary to avert the danger of revolution by passing a solemn and unanimous "vote" proclaiming Rome the capital of Italy. No steps were taken to make it such, however, and the ministry contented themselves with pledging themselves to go to Rome, *with the consent of Louis Napoleon.*

The popular excitement was lulled for a while, but not subdued, and Garibaldi, besieged and urged on every side by his old companions in arms, left Caprera early in 1862, and assembled a small body of volunteers in the Neapolitan provinces, with a view of attempting that expedition to Rome, which he might have triumphantly achieved when master of the military, naval, and financial resources of the former Neapolitan Kingdom.

Mazzini was well aware that the king would not allow Garibaldi to compromise him with Louis Napoleon, by inaugurating an expedition against the Pope in any portion of his dominions, but he believed that an insurrectionary attempt to free Venice, if supported by the prestige of Garibaldi, would awaken a national movement against Austria, so powerful as to be certain of ultimate success. In the hope of inducing the General to consent to this, he repeated the disinterested offer he had made to him in 1859. He despatched a friend to Garibaldi, to remind him that Naples being now a portion

of his own kingdom, Victor Emanuel would assuredly interfere to prevent the organization of any revolutionary attempt there. Venetia, however, still belonged to Austria, and the king would be as unable to prevent a Venetian insurrection, as he had been unable to prevent the popular insurrection against the tyrant of Sicily and Naples, in 1860. Let *us*, then, initiate the Venetian insurrection, he said; give us the moral support of your sympathy and approval, or, at least, do not weaken our hands by preaching the Roman enterprise now. If we succeed, join us, as you joined the Sicilian movement, and the power of your name will convert our insurrection into a national movement. You shall be master in Venice, as you were master in the South, and we will at once become mere soldiers in your ranks. If, however, we fail in our insurrectionary attempt, your name and authority will be left intact; I will take upon myself all the responsibility of the idea, and all the abuse and discredit consequent upon this failure, as I have done with regard to so many others.

Garibaldi, however, persisted in the Roman scheme, and Victor Emanuel, practising on his weakness, sent him word (it is said by an autograph letter) that although himself unable to risk offending the Catholic monarchs of Europe, by overthrowing the temporal power of the Pope, he would gladly shut his eyes if the work were done by others. Notwithstanding the past, so completely was Garibaldi deluded, that when the royal troops sent to bar his passage came in sight, he forbade his followers to fire, believing that they came as friends. The commander of the royal troops, however, knew the King's mind too well to have any scruples. He commanded his men to fire on Garibaldi as he advanced alone to parley

with them, and then conveyed him, a wounded prisoner, to the fortress of Varignano. It is scarcely necessary to say that the officer who executed this crime was immediately promoted by his royal master to the rank of General; but the reward bestowed by Victor Emanuel upon the man who had given him a crown, is an example of ingratitude sufficiently conspicuous to be notable even among Princes. The fury of the people found vent, as usual, in idle "demonstrations" in nearly every city in Italy, but these, the issue of impulse only, and bursting forth without concert or organization, were, after a considerable amount of useless bloodshed, put down by charges of cavalry, display of cannon and troops in the streets, etc., and when terror had done its work, it was followed by the favourite royal farce of a general amnesty, from which, however, Mazzini was expressly excluded. As Garrison has remarked, "whoever might have looked upon Mazzini as a visionary dreamer and impracticable theorist, assuredly they were not the despotic rulers in Europe; for they seemed to regard his revolutionary spirit as ubiquitous, credited him with either inciting or participating in whatever conspiracies threatened their overthrow, placed him under attainder, hunted him from kingdom to kingdom, forced him into foreign exile, and caused his footsteps to be dogged by venal spies."

The insurrection of Poland in 1863 afforded Mazzini fresh reason for urging his countrymen to fulfil their own duty by attacking the Austrian usurper in Venice, as by so doing they could materially aid the cause of the insurgent Poles. Believing that "the basis of all religion is the communion of mankind in aid of right and justice," he strove to arouse the Italians to an act of intervention for good, to counterbalance that eternal

intervention for evil which has ever been a part of the monarchical system. "The programme of the evil governments which weigh like an incubus upon the very soul of the nations," he said, "is '*alliance in order to oppress.*' Let yours be '*alliance in order to emancipate,*'" . . . the Prussian monarchy intervenes in aid of Russian Tzarism; none of the governments will intervene in aid of Poland. "It may be," he prophetically added, "that *the French Empire will now seize the long sought opportunity of a contest with Prussia, in order to usurp her Rhenish provinces,*—as it has usurped our Nizza, and Savoy,—and then withdraw from the enterprise, promising Poland a few *reforms.* The governments of the present day are *atheist*: not one of them will refuse the hand of the Ambassador of the Tzar. To the cry rising up around us: "*Cain, Cain, where is thy brother,*" they answer, like the first criminal: "*Are we our brother's keepers?*" Woe to Poland should she put faith in them! But we, Italians, believers in that faith for which the Poles are fighting; we for whom nationality is no mere local fact, but a holy principle; we whose own salvation depends upon the triumph of that principle in Europe; we, who have seen Poles fighting with us in all our battles; we 20,000,000 of men, possessed of an army, means, a strong strategic position, shall we give naught to Poland but an expression of sterile admiration, and the subscription of a few thousand francs in aid of exiles who will most likely be imprisoned long before they reach our frontier? I ask you these things with a beating heart. . . . . To Venice! to Venice! 100,000 Austrians there violate a territory which is ours; beneath which lies a hidden volcano of popular hatred and vengeance: the regiments that compose those 100,000 troops are full of

Hungarians and Poles, ready to follow you if you but rise to the cry, first taught to us by Poland, "*for your liberty and for our own.*"

Although no immediate response followed this appeal, the lasting protest of the Italian people against the dismemberment of their country and the insolent occupation of her true metropolis by Louis Napoleon in the name of the Pope, could never be wholly extinguished. New agitations rendered some new deception necessary, and in November of that year Mazzini received, through the medium of one in contact with the King, a message, the substance of which was, he says, as follows:—

"That the king could not understand our constantly conspiring, nor the setting up of a dualism between the Government and the Party of Action, in matters upon which they were substantially agreed; that he wanted Venice as much as I did; that he had faith in my sincerity and honesty of purpose; wherefore then should we not form a compact in furtherance of our common object?"

Mazzini well knew that war with Austria for Venice would require the union and conjunction of all the forces of the nation, the aid of the army, of insurrection in the Venetian provinces, and of the volunteers. It was a question of regaining Italian territory from a foreign usurper, under whatsoever banner might represent Italy for the time, and he therefore believed it would be both wrong and foolish to mix up the republican question with the national question of emancipating Venice, so as to unite her with the rest of Italy. He, however, declared to the king that the conquest of Venice must be achieved in such a manner as would awaken Italy to self-respect and dignity; the Italian army must therefore be assisted by a popular initiative, and the volunteers

under Garibaldi, etc., etc. He said that he would not bind himself by any compact, and reminded the king, he tells us, that "more than a year before—after Aspromonte—I had publicly declared that I resumed my complete independence, and would in future make no compacts save with the dictates of my own conscience, and added, that I believed it a duty towards myself and the Liberal party to maintain my independence. I said, 'that I could feel no confidence in any who followed the inspirations of the French Emperor, and that I foresaw that in case Louis Napoleon should become favourable to Austria, the warlike disposition of the government would be suddenly frozen by a telegram from Paris. No National policy ought to be subject to such variations, and I therefore considered it wiser to enter into no compact or agreement.

"'Besides, to what purpose enter into any agreement? It was known that I considered the united action of all the national forces necessary to the enterprise; known that I had no idea of raising the republican banner in Venetia; known that our party, though refraining, both through conscientiousness and self-respect, from shouting *Victor Emanuel*, and limiting itself to the cry of *War to Austria, help for our brothers*—yet left the choice of the programme to the Venetians themselves, who, needing as they did the army, would be certain to invoke the monarchy.

"'Did the king really want Venice as much as we did? He had only to leave us free to act, and prepare himself rapidly to seize the opportunity we would go to work to create. The method naturally pointed out by circumstances was *that the Venetians themselves should take the initiative by rising in insurrection, which*

should be responded to by popular manifestations and bands of volunteers, and the consequent intervention of the Government. The king, through his agents there, should say a word to the Venetians in the same spirit with ours; should diminish the adverse action of the Government towards us; cease to dispatch hostile *cordons* to the frontiers, and to seize our arms—(we acting with all possible prudence on our side)—hold the army, and—still more important—the navy, in readiness; banish from his mind every idea of French aid for Italy, or Italian aid for France in case of an attempt on the Rhine; leave Garibaldi the free and independent chief of the volunteers, and understand that a National enterprise is ill conducted by a ministry discredited in the eyes of the country, and deliberately hostile to our party.'

"I shall not descend to detail the particulars of the intercourse that succeeded. It is repugnant to my nature to reveal the words or designs of others, be they whom they may. I however affirm—and let him deny my words who can—that no letter of mine contained one syllable inconsistent with this letter of the 15th November. I said nothing either of our elements, our intentions, or the work in progress.

"I carried my independence to the point of rejecting certain hypothetical offers of pecuniary aid towards our object, saying that any such aid would constitute a bond between the giver and the receiver, and that I would accept no such bond. And I recommended that the assistance should be transferred to the Polish and Hungarian Liberal parties.

"On the 25th January (1864), wearied by the continual hesitation and wavering I encountered, and desirous of speaking frankly, I said that 'the language of

the Government, and of the Ministerial circulars was cowardly and shuffling; far more fatal to the monarchy than to us; that we were willing to make effort after effort, but that should we find ourselves completely prevented from acting, I must inevitably concentrate all my energies upon the internal question, and the republican apostolate.' And I repeated that 'what was necessary to be done was to give the *mot d'ordre* of action to the Venetians; to allow the volunteers to flock to their assistancce when they should rise; not to oppose popular manifestations demanding help for Venice, and to declare to foreign Governments, as Charles Albert had done in 1848, that the Government was *constrained* to act.'

"When I heard of the seizure of arms in Brescia and Milan, I declared 'that I would neither be *mystified* by princes nor others; I demanded that those arms should be given back, or an equal number supplied; that Spaventa* should be dismissed from office as security for the future, or I should consider that hostility of intention was evident, and cease all further contact.'

"'Finally, on the 25th May, I wrote:—'It is clear that we cannot understand each other . . . I was told at first that it was impossible to produce an *external* initiative. I answered that the question was one of *internal* initiative. I was then told that an *anterior* movement in Gallicia was required. I answered that though adverse to this sudden change of scheme and of language with our allies, yet I would endeavour to arrange this. Now a movement in Hungary also is asked; to-morrow it will be Bohemia, the dissolution of the empire of Austria, before it is attacked. Meantime, by next year we shall have Poland slain; the Gallician movement rendered

* The minister who had seized the arms of the volunteers.

impossible; the Danish question concluded, and Hungary in the hands of the Party of Conciliation.' *

"'This is no Italian policy. It is a policy of fear, unworthy of a people of twenty-two millions, possessing an army of 300,000 men. It is impossible to treat of questions so vital without fixing some limit as to time. *These things cannot be done,* I am told, *except at the opportune moment.* It is precisely because I believe the moment opportune that I endeavour to seize it. You should have told me the reason why the present moment is inopportune, or have said to me, *we intend to act at such a time,* and not till then. Merely to tell me that arms cannot be allowed to be sent across the frontier, for fear the Venetians should use them, is to throw me back into the indefinite. To tell me *that even if the Venetians rise, we shall be prevented from helping them,* is the same thing as to tell me *the Government has decided to take part with Austria.*'"

This letter, which was published in the Italian papers, thus concludes: — "I therefore renounce a contact which is useless. I remain free; free from every bond save with my own conscience. On that ground kings and citizens are equal."

The gift of the rich kingdom of Naples had not, however, inspired the king with sufficient courage to do his duty. He remained, none the less, the humble vassal of France, and, in 1864, entered into a Convention with Louis Napoleon, by which the emperor bound himself to withdraw his troops from Rome in two years time, on condition of Victor Emanuel's

* "All these predictions," says Mazzini, in a note to the published copy of this letter, "have been too truly fulfilled, and I feel my cheek burn with shame when I remember the number of propitious opportunities Italy has let slip, and the promises she has broken to poor, sacred Poland."

taking upon himself the ignoble task of maintaining the Pope upon his throne against the will of the Roman people, and the payment of a heavy sum of money to the Emperor, in compensation for the expenses he had incurred in performing the same base office for thirteen years. This portion of the Convention was public, for this much it was believed the people would gladly accept, in the joy of seeing their French invaders depart; while, in the hope of quieting the cry for "Rome the capital" in the Centre, one article of the Convention further stipulated that the city of Florence should henceforth hold that dignity, the king and his "magnanimous ally" trusting that the material advantages of the arrangement would induce Central Italy to approve this renewed sanction of the imaginary rights of the King-Priest. But the Convention also contained a secret protocol,* ceding a large portion of Piedmont to France as compensation for the expenses of the occupation of Rome, and guaranteeing the equally monstrous rights which Austria had usurped over Venetia in 1815.

The success of the monarchical intrigue would have been perfect, but for the sleepless vigilance of Mazzini, who was aware of the secret protocol and published its contents. So great a storm of indignation was aroused that the

* By this treacherous clause Victor Emanuel bound himself not only to abstain from any effort to win Venetia, but energetically to interfere to prevent "the party of action" from doing so, and further agreed that should the force of circumstances (*i.e.*, the action of the people) render it impossible for him to maintain the obligations he had assumed in this fraudulent treaty, so that either Rome or Venice should be united to Italy in spite of him,—*a rectification of the French frontier* should take place, giving to France the whole of that portion of Piedmont lying between Savona on the Ligurian coast and the River Sesia. A glance at the map will show that this arrangement yielded up to France all the passes of the Appenines from Savona to Acqui, up to the Alpine pass of the little St Bernardo.

minister who had signed the Convention (a renegade from YOUNG ITALY, named Visconti Venosta) found it necessary to adopt the usual diplomatic method in such inconvenient moments—a lie. He solemnly declared to the Chamber that Mazzini's assertion was false, and the whole monarchical press combined to echo the lie and to heap abuse upon the head of the venerable exile who had thus dared to "tell truth and shame the devil."

At this deliberate treachery on the part of the king, Mazzini felt that the time had arrived when it was his duty to raise again the republican banner, and, according to promise, he gave public warning of his intention, saying:—"The Plebiscites, the Government, the Parliament, and the Country have all pledged themselves to make Italy one nation, and Rome her capital. The Convention cancels that solemn, collective decree. The people will remember that agreements which are violated by one of the contracting parties, become null for the other. We republicans bowed to the popular will: the Convention sets us free. We swore that we would create Italy, *with, without,* or *against* the existing power. If this Convention become a fact, the two first methods will be at an end: we will fulfil the third." In a public letter addressed to a renegade republican,* he declared that henceforth the sole means of practically realizing the unity of Italy was, to separate the cause from those who merely usurped its name to serve their own interests, and to point out to the people the only path left upon which to reach unity—revolution. They must make common cause against Austria with the other nations suffering under her yoke, by attacking her in Venice: they must win Rome to Italy in the name of their Italian right, proclaim liberty of conscience in

* Crispi.

the centre of religious despotism, and frame a National Pact (Constitution) which should be the true expression of the will, not of a portion of the nation, but of the whole united people, and the safeguard of that united will, in the future. "Do this," he cried to the people, "at any cost, and to the overthrow of every obstacle in our path, and if among the obstacles monarchy prove one—then, in the name of God and Italy, let us not draw back before a phantom, but rise up a Republic."

This letter called forth a threatening circular from Napoleon's minister* to the Italian Government, desiring them to put down every symptom of popular feeling that might imply that the King was not strong enough to maintain the Convention, and to make it perfectly clear to the people that the choice of Florence as the capital of Italy was *final*, and that the people would never be allowed to regard it as a step towards Rome; and warning the king that should he fail to keep his subjects at peace with the Pope, not only France, but all the Catholic powers in Europe would turn upon him, etc. New persecutions of the National party were of course the result. The Sicilians, always foremost in Italian and republican feeling, had constantly been growing more disaffected towards the crown, and it was entirely owing to Mazzini's earnest appeal to them in the name of unity, that they were induced to abandon the enterprise of a separatist revolution in that year.

It is important once again to call attention to the fact that the anti-national policy so long pursued by the Italian Government would have been impossible, were it not for that immoral system which is the bulwark of tyranny in every court in Europe — *secret diplomacy*. The ministerial press, and "the whole

* Drouyn de L'huys.

tribe of the gentry that goes by the name of *diplomatists, ambassadors, secretaries of legation,*" etc., systematically deceived the people as to the intentions of the Government, until each violation of the national duty and dignity had become an accomplished fact, confirmed and endorsed by the neighbouring powers, and leaving the people no other alternative than submission or revolution.

In 1865 the citizens of Messina publicly protested against the sentence of death still hanging over Mazzini's head, by electing him as their representative in the Italian Parliament. He, however, refused to accept the mandate, saying that even were he permitted to return, he could not reconcile it to his conscience to swear fidelity to the monarchy; that, four-and-thirty years before, he had sworn fidelity to the idea of a united, republican Italy, and that although when the People had resolved to attempt to unite Italy under the monarchical flag, he had felt it to be his duty to bow to the popular will, and had even endeavoured to aid the experiment by pointing out to the king the methods by which he might have made Italy one, he had never been false to his first oath. Now that the king had violated the *plebiscite* which had decreed Rome the metropolis,—had accepted the Convention which recognized the sovereignty of the Pope, and disbanded the large army raised at an enormous cost of the public treasure, on the pretence of emancipating Venice, he would not swear fidelity to a Constitution which had been framed in a single Italian province,*

* Piedmont. The existing Constitution of Italy was hastily wrung from Charles Albert at a period when all the princes of Italy found it necessary to make concessions to their subjects or lose their crowns, in 1848.

and was in no sense the expression of the will of the Italian people. "More than ever convinced that the king is incapable of rendering Italy one, free, great and prosperous, in the sense in which you and I understand those words," he concluded, "I should, by taking such an oath, set an example of political immorality to my Italian brothers, to my own undying remorse."

The evident indications of an approaching struggle between Austria and Prussia, in 1866, rendered it impossible for the Italian monarchy to resist the popular cry for war. The embarrassment of Austria presented too clearly that favourable "opportunity" which the king had so long pretended to await with impatience, and to have abstained at that time from the attempt to regain the Italian provinces still subject to her rule, would have been to abandon the movement into the hands of the people, and must ultimately have cost Victor Emanuel his crown.

The force of the National flood which burst its bounds in '47-'48 gradually overwhelmed those princes of the Centre and South who openly endeavoured to arrest its course. King Victor Emanuel, more crafty than his fellows, stood by on the shore, and snatching their crowns from their heads as they sank, proclaimed these the gift of the people. When the mighty waters threatened his own throne, the Savoyard adventurer set it afloat upon the current he could not stem; and allowed it to drift this way or that, according to the ebb or flow of the stream; shouting meanwhile, with the instinct of a mountebank, "*Behold how I lead the way!*"

Mazzini had published some masterly letters on the war, warning the Italians to allow no French intervention on Italian soil, to be afterwards repaid by some

new, disgraceful cession of territory to the "magnanimous ally," and protesting also against any alliance with Prussia; reminding the Italians that they had no right to win back their own provinces at the cost of an alliance with a tyrant who had shared in the dismemberment of Poland, and stifled the cry for liberty among his own subjects, in blood. The crime of such an alliance would bring its own punishment with it, by necessitating the abandonment of Trieste and the Trentino, in deference to the pretended "rights" of the Germanic Confederation. The Italians were bound to do their own duty for themselves by attacking Austria, and the only righteous or safe alliances for them must be sought among the other subject peoples unwillingly chained to the car of Austria. A new war of kings eager for new dynastic aggrandisement, would be regarded by the suffering peoples with antagonism or indifference, while a national war would at once arouse the sympathy, and, if prolonged, obtain the effectual aid of Hungarians, Bohemians, Servians, Roûmanes, and those southern Slavonian populations parcelled out between Austria and Turkey. In order to ensure the national character of the war, the people should supplement the royal troops by assembling vast bodies of volunteers, etc.

The journals in which Mazzini's letter was published were at once sequestrated by the Government, but it produced a burst of national enthusiasm during which 95,000 volunteers offered their services to the Minister of War, who exclaimed in terror, "This cannot be allowed to go on! this is a *levée en masse!*" and the greater number were dismissed, while even of those at first enrolled, numbers were afterwards disbanded with the assurance that the royal army was more than sufficient for

the enterprise.* The city of Messina chose this moment to repeat her protest against Mazzini's exile, by again electing him as her representative to the Italian Parliament. The election was annulled by the servile monarchical majority of the Chamber, but the state of public feeling compelled the king — who had previously allied himself with Prussia — to declare war against Austria (June 1866).

Had the king possessed a spark of true Italian feeling, the unexpected collapse of the Austrian army before Prussia might have inspired him with courage to defy France and carry on the war; but this would have called forth the popular element, which he feared far more than Austria. General Medici, who had fought with inconvenient earnestness, and driven all before him in the Trentino, was abruptly recalled when he had carried his victorious troops within a few miles of Trento, and the heroic alpine population which had supplied so large a proportion of volunteers in aid of Italian freedom, was again treacherously consigned to Austrian rule.† The success of Prussia having rendered it impossible for Louis Napoleon to turn the war to his own advantage by seizing upon her Rhenish provinces, he also desired to put an end to it, and the Italian General-in-Chief (La Marmora) and the High Admiral (Persano) obediently allowed themselves to be beaten at Custoza and Lissa. The defeat of both was, however, so unaccountable and so ignominious, that the cry of treachery was raised on every side, and the truth of Mazzini's assertions as to the secret protocol became evident to all but the wilfully blind.

* The few who were at length enrolled under Garibaldi were despatched—ill-armed and equipped—to some of the most exposed Alpine positions, cut off from all assistance from the regular army.

† Garibaldi and his volunteers were recalled at the same time.

These were afterwards completely confirmed by the revelations of Count Bismarck, who made known the fact that, as far as the Italian Government was concerned, the idea of a war of liberation "from the Alps to the sea" had been a royal comedy from the first, it having, in fact, been arranged between Louis Napoleon and the king that, after the first defeats of Prussia, (which were regarded as certain,) Victor Emanuel should withdraw from the alliance with her, and leaving the path open for the fulfilment of the Rhenish idea, be allowed to take possession of Venice, both as the price of his own treachery and a sop to the Italian people.

Owing, however, to the sleepless vigilance which had exposed the royal gambler's hands, and warned the Italian people in time, it became impossible fully to carry out the provisions of the plot. Napoleon dared not seize upon the huge slice of Piedmont which he had bargained for, while the Italian army was still in the field and the aroused people on the alert. The first act only of the comedy was performed, Napoleon had no further interest in carrying on the war, and Austria, crippled and disabled, ceded Venice, not to Italy, but to Napoleon, who flung it to the Italian people "like a bone to quiet a hungry dog." Unhappily, the dog, though growling still, was quieted by the bone, and the heroic populations of the insurgent Trentino were abandoned to the former masters.

Mazzini used every effort to arouse the people to compel the king to carry on the war till the whole of Italy were free, or to carry it on themselves in spite of him, but the majority in the chamber, the monarchical press, all that was venal and time-serving in Italy, combined to drown the cry of the betrayed Trentino; to heap fresh abuse upon him who spoke of national duty; to

extol anew the "magnanimous ally" and the "sword of Italy," and to declare the unity of Italy achieved by the *conquest* of Venice; while, possibly in the vain hope of silencing the severe voice of the exile, an amnesty was granted to him by royal decree. Equally unmoved by clemency and by abuse, he continued to warn the people that the passes of the Alps, the keys of Italy, were still in the hands of the robber—and to preach the duty of the people to win back every inch of Italian soil. It was only at the conclusion of one of his writings on that subject that he deigned to say,—"I have just heard that they have granted to me an amnesty. None who know me will expect me to give the lie to the whole of my past life and to sully the few years left to me by accepting an offer of oblivion and *pardon* for having loved Italy above all earthly things, and preached and striven for her unity when all men else despaired of her. But even were I capable of this, I should not have the heart to see Italy again on the day when she could calmly accept crime and dishonour."

The crime and dishonour were accepted, and Mazzini publicly declared that the experiment as to whether the monarchy could or would unite Italy, was complete. "Since 1859," said he, "the Italian Republicans have actively assisted and upheld the Government with an abnegation worthy of all praise, sacrificing even their right of apostolate to the great idea of Italian unity, and patiently awaiting the result of the trial which the nation chose to give to monarchy; resigned to endure any amount of misgovernment rather than afford a pretext to those in power for the non-fulfilment of their declared intention of initiating *a war to regain our own territory and our own frontier;* a war which they knew to be the supreme and sole condition of Italy's security

and honour, and which, had it been conducted from a truly national point of view, would have wrought the moral unity and redemption of our people. The monarchy had five years to prepare this war, unlimited supplies of money, an obsequious parliament, and the whole of Italy—as facts have proved—ready for every description of sacrifice in blood or money. What has been the result? Our monarchy, which had taken the field with 350,000 regular troops, 100,000 mobilized national guards, 30,000 volunteers under Garibaldi, and the whole nation ready to act as reserve, abruptly broke off the war—after the unqualifiable disasters of Custoza and Lissa—at a signal from France, basely abandoning our true frontier, the heroic Trentino, and accepted Venice as an alms, scornfully flung to us by the man of the 2d December."

The last hope that the national duty would ever be performed by monarchy being extinct, he therefore proclaimed that the sole course left open to those who set the unity and freedom of their country above all things, was once more to preach the republic as the only means by which to achieve either.

Palermo arose in insurrection in that year, but the noble initiative not being followed by the other provinces of Italy, the king was able to send an overwhelming force to bombard the city, and "restore order" under a military Government, by which the island has been held in indignant subjection until the present day.

It is not necessary to relate here the dissensions created in the national party by the irresolution of Garibaldi, nor his ill-advised attempt to liberate Rome from the rule of the Pope and his French protector, with a mere handful of half-equipped followers. The ceaseless activity of Mazzini, and his incessant appeals

to the people through the liberal press, had revived the sense of national honour and dignity, and rendered the Roman question again the question of the hour with all that were worthiest in Italy, and there can be no doubt that had the popular soldier frankly joined his influence to that of Mazzini, a national movement might have been aroused at that time, of such magnitude as to compel the King once more to play the patriot to preserve his crown. But Garibaldi—whatever his motives may have been—would never consent to sink the political in the national question, and to rally the people round him in the sole name of their right to their own country. He persisted in enrolling in the name of the very king who had undertaken to maintain the authority of the Pope, and who was perpetually assuring the Holy Father of his filial devotion to his cause. It is true that Garibaldi whispered to his followers the old story that the king was with them at heart, and would offer merely a show of resistance, in order to avoid offending France; the experience of past treachery awakened distrust and suspicion in the masses, while the republicans cared not to risk their lives for the sake of adding another jewel to the crown, and the division thus sown in the popular camp rendered a powerful and well-concerted movement impossible. Perceiving the weakness of Garibaldi's following, the wily king gave a colour of truth to his representations by allowing him openly to enrol the devoted little band foredoomed to be massacred by the "wonders" of the French *Chassepots*, the king playing the part of policeman on the occasion, by arresting Garibaldi as soon as he had re-crossed the frontier, and imprisoning him in the fortress of Alexandria. It is needless to say that the whole of the monarchical press declared the ill-fated expedition, which

Mazzini had earnestly deprecated, to have been his work. The history of the succeeding year is a confused record of domiciliary visits and arrests, of conspiracies—a few real, but more imaginary,—of sequestrations of the liberal journals, seizures of deposits of arms, etc., worthy of notice merely as a proof that in spite of the gradual moral disintegration of the popular element consequent upon the corruption of the Government, so long as Mazzini lived, the spirit of nationality and the instinct of unity could never wholly expire in the hearts of the Italian people.

The Italian Government finding it still impossible to destroy his "fatal influence," had again recourse to the weapon of calumny, and accusing him of preparing a vast conspiracy of assassination and pillage, demanded of the Swiss Government his expulsion from Switzerland. He answered them in a public letter, addressed, "To my Enemies," refusing to defend himself from their accusations, and saying—

"The recent accusations made against me in your journals prove you to be at once immoral, cowardly, and stupid. Immoral, because you utter them knowing them to be false; cowardly, because you, masters of the constituted authorities, of vast financiary means, and of an army which you say is devoted to you,—yet employ against us the disloyal weapons of spies and calumny, thus proving your impotence with other means; and stupid, because you imagine that the country which you have daily deceived throughout long years, will credulously accept your accusations, and believe me and my friends capable of hiring assassins, or promoting violation of property and pillage.

"The country—I do not mean the few hundred intriguers who serve you for lucre's sake to-day, as they

would serve us to-morrow, could we accept such men—the country knows you, and is beginning to know us. These millions have seen you retire from power swollen with riches, and have seen us leave power, poorer than before." . . . . "They have heard what numbers of our party have died in poverty in exile, and they have understood that if we, like all mankind, are liable to intellectual error, we have neither vices nor base envy to satisfy at the expense of the property of others, or of our country."

He explained the universal discontent and continual agitation that alarmed the monarchical party by the fact that the Italian people had before them "a spectacle of arbitrary government; of the public offices bestowed on the privileged by wealth or birth; of corruption disseminated from above; of labour impeded at every step, both in production and circulation; of ignorance fostered—because an instrument of servitude—among the masses, while the right to bear arms and the franchise were denied to the majority, and consequently, of periodical revolutions and constant attempts at insurrection, fatal to peace, industry, and commerce, but inevitable when both duties and rights are systematically denied."

Then, alluding to a late insurrectionary attempt at Milan, which he had been falsely accused of promoting, he said:—

"I,—since your persistence in attributing to me anything that alarms you, compels me to speak of myself,—I am, and shall be, while I live, your irreconcileable enemy. You have crucified the honour of my country in the sight of the nations, and done all that in you lay to cause the future assigned to her by God to recede—a future, the sole prevision of which was enough to make me consecrate to it heart, life, and soul, deeming every

possible sacrifice largely repaid. But neither the immense love I bear to Italy, nor the deep anger I feel towards all who traduce, corrupt, or mislead her, has ever made me employ disloyal weapons against you, stoop to accusations in which I did not fully believe, or deny you that liberty of experiment which you invoked with such hypocritical promises some years back. When in 1848 you solemnly declared that the monarchy took the field against Austria in order to fulfil a duty towards Italy, and pledged yourselves to the country to leave her arbitress of her own fate at the conclusion of the war;—when in 1859 and 1866 you declared through the lips of your dictators, 'the monarchy is possessed of an army, treasury, and long-organised resources, it can and will give you all you desire—Rome, the Alps, external independence, and internal liberty, at less cost and with greater certainty of success than you can obtain them for yourselves'—I, incredulous myself, but reverent to the opinion of the country which trusted in you, and induced by an innate love of justice to give you the means of fulfilling your promises, was silent as to the republic, did my best to aid your war and to further your annexation of the Centre and the South; abstained from all secret work, from all that you could call conspiracy; waited till time should make known your intentions, and promised you that if ever I should feel compelled to resume my former course, I would give you warning.

"Then, towards the close of 1866, I once more raised that republican banner which bears within its folds the destinies of Italy, and in the name of the believers in that banner, published a manifesto saying to you, 'You will have war—then be it war.'

"Which of us is disloyal? We who awaited patiently

till every possible means of concord had been exhausted, and when every experiment had been tried, and every hope betrayed, openly separated ourselves from you; or you, who waded through the blood of our martyrs, by which the ground was prepared, availing yourselves of our silence and the illusions of a whole people who trusted your promises,—to seat yourselves in powerful and armed dominion upon the neck of Italy, and say to her, 'We belong, not to you, but to the dynasty,' and to us, 'You are robbers and assassins.'

"You had the prestige of a name—Rome—sacred among the peoples; the historic records of whose two epochs of civilisation were a pledge of the world's respect and love; and you have, while protesting the contrary, annihilated that prestige, abandoned Rome to the Papal phantom, and silently submitted to be told by a French minister that she should never be yours.

"Our long apostolate, and the blood and sacrifices of our party, had created for you and implanted in the very heart of the multitude such a worship of unity as is in itself a gigantic force, a strong bond of love and pledge of a common mission, and you, by dint of misgovernment, by halting half-way on your course, have embittered the miserable commencement of unity we do possess, and given birth to a spirit of federalism which would—should it endure—be fatal to our country. You had a splendid historical tradition, pointing out to you the method by which to render unity permanent, through the development of the two inseparable elements of Italian life—the nation and the commune; and you, by restricting the suffrage, and by the administrative tyranny of prefects, delegates, and carabineers, have crushed all activity in our communes, even as by denying it a national Pact, and compressing it within

the limits of a *statuto*" (constitution) "framed before unity was even begun, and dictated in a moment of terror by the king who betrayed Milan—you have stifled the national life.

"I would not wear out the last uncertain remnant of life left to me for a question merely political, to hasten by a few years or months the foundation of republican institutions. The Republic is inevitable in Italy within a brief period, and I would leave it to time and your errors to do the work for us. But though a question of liberty or finance may be safely left to the slow development of progressive ideas, a question of honour may not. Dishonour is to a people a gangrene, which, if not fought against in time, is fatal to their national life. A people which, though able to do otherwise, resigns itself to foreign insult, which, though strong enough to be free and master of its own destiny, consents to drag on in a semblance of freedom so far as others allow and no further, is lost—it abdicates its power and its future.

"We will publish and republish, through the press, (open or clandestine, according to your persecutions,) these words, which my friend Lamennais—one of the holiest of our party, and too little remembered amongst us—addressed to the people shortly before his death:—'Know this. Whenever in extremity of suffering you determine to win back the rights of which your oppressors have despoiled you, they will revile you as disturbers of order, and strive to defame you as rebels. Rebels against whom? There is no rebellion possible save against the true sovereign, the people, and how can the people rebel against the people? The rebels are those who create iniquitous privileges for themselves, to the injury of the people; who impose their dominion upon them

by force or fraud; and when the people overthrow that dominion they do not disturb order; they do God's work and execute His ever just will.'

"Is the people with you? Have you beside your vast organized forces and the prestige—so powerful over most minds—of a long past, the majority of the country, of the governed, in your favour? Why, then, culumniate us? Why shrink in anger from the apostolate of our ideas? Grant us freedom in that apostolate; grant us the press free from sequestration; grant us liberty of association, whatever the political programme; grant us individual liberty, unhampered by domiciliary visits, preventive imprisonment, and violation of correspondence; grant me, who write these lines, free transit from city to city, and the right to convene meetings, in order to explain my republican doctrine to all who wish to hear me. We will then promise you to abstain from all secret organization, from all preparation for that which you call rebellion, but which would, in fact, be the restoration to the people, for the fulfilment of their national revolution, of that initiative which you have interrupted and suppressed.

"Why do you not dare to do as England does, and admit the inviolability of thought? Why will you confiscate this writing of mine? Why do you make it a crime in your soldiers to read our newspapers? Why do you ask Switzerland to banish me? Has Switzerland ever asked you to banish any son of hers, for fear of a monarchical apostolate?

"No, you will do none of these things. You could not if you would. You are not a national government. You rule solely through force. Do so, so long as that force sustains you. But complain not if, having opposed apostolate by apostolate, the day come when—in the

name of Rome betrayed, of our Italian honour violated, our independence cast at the foot of the foreigner, our provinces bartered away, our country's finance ruined, our army shamed and degraded, our national life deprived of all legal expression or Pact—we oppose force by force.

"You are not a national government in Italy. Herein lies your sentence; the secret of the actual state of things and our eternal right.

"These things," he concluded, "I have felt bound to declare to you, interpreter of your fate, so that you may know what I do believe, and how I despise your accusations. I and my best friends deliberately opposed the immature attempt which has lately filled you with such terror; but I do not mean, by this, to defend myself to you. So soon as I shall see reason to think I can help your overthrow, I shall consider it my duty, as an Italian, to do so, and I shall do so with a conscience both calm and glad."

In reviewing Mazzini's career, we seem to behold the struggle of the genius of Italy, personified by him, with the evil spirit of privilege, personified by the monarchy. In 1848 when the spirit of nationality, evoked by Mazzini, inspired the people to arise in the name of their own duty and their own right, they were everywhere victorious without the help of foreign arms, but intoxicated by the joy of independence from foreign oppression, they neglected to secure their internal freedom, and instead of gathering the fruits of their victory, cast them at the feet of Charles Albert of Piedmont, who (he confessed it to his brother princes) entered the field solely for the purpose of quelling the ancient republican spirit rekindled by the victories achieved by the people. The nation abdicated its right in his favour, and was rewarded by being again handed over to her foreign foe.

Ten years later, when Mazzini had once more fanned the fire to flame, Cavour, a man whom he has well described as "destitute of all creative genius himself, but highly gifted with the talent of appropriating that of others," perceived that it was necessary for his master to perform the former patriotic farce upon a larger scale and feign to lead, in order to prevent the leadership of others. "Unwilling," says Mazzini, "to employ the popular forces of Italy, *and desirous of securing an ally against them in the future,* he purchased, by guilty compacts, the alliance of the despot who had slaughtered Rome at the feet of the Pope, and condemned our national banner to follow the tortuous policy of Imperial France." When Louis Napoleon abruptly brought the war to a close, the royal deceiver "stopped short half-way upon his course, never to advance a step further save on compulsion." That compulsion, it was henceforth the work of Mazzini's life to supply, and the war of 1866 was, in fact, undertaken because he had rendered it impossible for the king to hold back. We have seen how that war was again broken off at a nod from the French emperor, and how the mean-spirited king consented to receive, as *his* gift, the plains of Venetian Lombardy still reeking with the best blood of the Italian army and people.

"They who, to serve royalty, persist in regarding the consequences and not the causes of events," wrote Mazzini, one short year before his death, "may say what they please to-day. History and the conscience of Italy will declare that the popular element willed our unity, when our monarchy was still plotting confederations with Austria, the Bourbon, and the Pope; that the French design of a Bonapartist kingdom in the Centre was accepted by our royal busybodies, and only

overthrown by us through the plebiscite; that the emancipation of the South was the work of our volunteers and people; that the monarchical invasion of the Papal States was a necessity created by the important preparations made for a similar expedition by us in Tuscany and Genoa, and the manifest intentions of Garibaldi; that Venice was not a victory won, but an *alms* bestowed; that without the alarm excited by the guerillas in Calabria and the Centre, the attempts at Piacenza and Pavia, the imminence of similar movements in other cities, and the sudden proclamation of the republic in Paris, our monarchy would not even now be in Rome" (1871).

In 1870 Mazzini felt it his duty to leave England for Sicily. The gradual deterioration of his countrymen under the corrupt rule of the House of Savoy, which had allowed them to acquiese in disgrace after disgrace, had poured into his cup of sorrow its last, bitterest drop—the sense of shame; but while he sadly confessed that a "people of twenty-four millions which tamely submits to dishonour for itself, its army, and its volunteers, deserves it," he was too just to forget that "it is in the nature of the mass to look upward and to rule their own conduct by the example set by the governing power." He saw that the Italian people had no consciousness of their true power and mission, and that in spite of the quasi-completion of the material unity of his native land, "the great soul of Italy still lay prostrate in the tomb dug for her three centuries ago by the papacy and the empire," but he declared that "the cause was to be found in the immorality and corruption of her rulers." For some time past the frequent *émeutes* and chronic disaffection of Sicily, and notably of Palermo, had disturbed and alarmed the Italian

Government, and it had been deemed necessary to appoint General Medici to the Governorship of Palermo, a man more feared and hated than any of those who had held Sicily in subjection to the crown, for it was well known that he would shrink from no severity to protect the King's authority from overthrow. The Sicilians had made frequent propositions to Mazzini to give the support of his approval to an insurrection having as its purpose the separation of the island from the rest of Italy, and the establishment of a Sicilian Republic; but this he had invariably opposed in the name of Italian unity. For a time his influence prevailed, but at last the revolutionary party informed him that the date of the rising was fixed, and, while urging him to head the movement, declared that, with or without him, the attempt would be made. He replied, bidding them rise not in name of Sicily, but of Italy, and decided to go amongst them in order to throw the whole weight of his authority and influence in the scale of unity, at any cost. He had no belief in the success of the proposed insurrection, and some of those who were near him at the time, fancied that they detected in him the half-unconscious hope that he might die in the struggle.

The Judas who betrayed him was one who had frequently been denounced to him as a spy, and towards whom he had frequently confessed an instinctive personal repugnance and distrust, against which the excessive generosity of his nature compelled him to struggle, but he never so far overcame it as to trust secrets concerning the lives of others to his keeping. "He has known of my journeys in the days when I was condemned to death," he would say, "and yet I have always passed in safety; therefore, so long as the danger is only my own,

I may run the risk." The error here was two-fold. He was too noble to realize the full baseness of the reptile by whom he was stung, and to remember that by giving him up while condemned to death, the spy would have gained a sum *but lost an income*, which, so long as he betrayed his movements in time to frustrate their purpose, was secure.

Mazzini was arrested at sea, and conveyed in a ship of war to Gaëta, to be once more imprisoned between sea and sky, in the highest and most inaccessible tower of the stupendous fortress, built upon that portion of the huge rock which stretches furthest into the sea. The whole oft he little rocky peninsula upon which the fortress stands, bristled with cannon and was crowded with troops, while beneath the tower where the frail prisoner was confined, lay five ironclad war steamers.

The arrest of Mazzini having taken place by the order of General Medici, the insurrection of Palermo was rendered impossible, as it proved that the governor, who had already demanded large re-inforcements of troops from the Continent, was entirely on his guard. That danger being removed, therefore, the Government became greatly embarrassed with their prisoner, dreading any injury to his health, from the consciousness that should mischief happen to him, it would assuredly be attributed to design. The opportunity of the birth of a Prince—two months later—was therefore gladly seized to open the gates of Gaëta, and again "offer him pardon and oblivion for having loved his country above all things."

As he was extremely anxious to avoid all *demonstrations* in his "honour" from countrymen who had forgotten the honour of Italy, he started from Gaëta at early dawn, and was accompanied in his journey across

the Campagna of Rome* only by the friend who had been permitted access to him in prison, one who knew him well enough to keep silence during the bitter hours while, with the full knowledge that it was for the last time, he gazed once more upon the city which had been "the dream of his young years, the religion of his soul." During that journey he was very still; his face wore a look of faith in renunciation in which was written the history of his life—a look never to be forgotten by her who beheld him with a reverence newly mixed with awe, and recalling the solemn image of "the eternal type of all martyrs of genius and love"—

"*Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine, be done.*"

I have said that it had been his intention not to enter Rome; that he desired to see her no more, rather than to see her "profaned by monarchy." The train, however, went no further that night, and it being impossible to find any resting-place outside the city gates, he was compelled to await the starting of the next train for Genoa at the first hotel that presented itself within the walls, where, by giving a false name, he succeeded in remaining unknown.

In Genoa he remained for a few days secluded in the house of a friend, and having visited his mother's grave, by night, he returned to England in order to spend a few months with those early friends whose highest honour it must ever be that he declared "their affection the best consolation for the loss of the home denied to him in his native Italy." But he shortly after renounced the consolations of age, as he had formerly renounced the joys of youth, in the service of his country, and left England for Lugano in order to conduct the publication of a republi-

* Appendix B.

can journal, to be called *La Roma del Popolo*,* the first number of which he had determined to have issued in Rome on the anniversary of the proclamation of the republic. On the eve of his departure, he wrote—"The delusions and errors of the past ten years, the false route upon which our new-born Italy has been led by incompetent and corrupt leaders, have convinced me, to my sorrow, that the political education of my countrymen is less advanced than I once hoped. The Italian question, which I believed might ere this have become a question of action and realization, is still a question of education." And to this education he resolved, undeterred by ingratitude, and unwearied by failure, to consecrate the remainder of his fragile and suffering life. His journal of republican propaganda would, he said, "be conducted by men who had never denied their soul's belief and ideal through worldly temptations, delusions, sorrows, exile or imprisonment . . . . their programme—the republican unity of Italy—dates back for more than a quarter of a century; and although at times they have sadly abstained from its written apostolate, when it was evident that only the bitter lessons of experience could awaken our deluded people from the monarchical illusion, they have never forsaken or abjured it. Now, more firmly than ever convinced of its truth by the lessons of the last ten years, they once again raise their banner of forty years ago." He saw that it was because the people of Italy, although republican by tradition and by instinct, had no deeply meditated and solemnly accepted faith in democracy as a principle, that they had ever been so easily allured from the straight path of duty and sacrifice—the sole path of national regeneration—by every temptation of apparent expediency or

* The Rome of the People.

temporary interest offered through monarchy, and, with undaunted patience, once more set before himself the task of teaching his countrymen "that republicanism which is the affirmation of God's law of progress, and therefore invincible." "By decree of Providence, gloriously revealed in the progressive history of humanity, not Italy alone," said he, "but Europe, is fast advancing towards democracy. The most logical form of democracy is the republic. The republic, therefore, is one of the facts of the future. But this fact, in order to be lasting, must be founded upon a religious basis. The republic must be founded upon the new conception of Progress, not considered as a mere philosophical theory, but as the *divine law of life*, providentially regulating the accomplishment of human destiny *through human effort*. Its instrument will be the largest possible application of the principle of *association* between man and man, peoples and peoples; its aim,—the fulfilment, through the highest possible development of liberty, of that law of equality between soul and soul, which, visibly or not, lies at the root of every great synthesis linking man to God. The republic, so founded, will be not only a political, but a mighty religious fact."

After a year of unwearied literary labour in the *Roma del Popolo*, labour only to be carried on through a constant "miracle of will," in defiance of incessant illness and ever-recurring attacks of intense physical pain, Mazzini, in an unwonted interval of ease, wrote to his friends in England announcing his intention of spending with them a cherished anniversary, which it had been his custom to pass among them whenever the dangers and difficulties of his troubled life allowed. His desire to accomplish this induced him to cross the Alps at a season extremely dangerous to one of health so frail.

He was seized with acute pleurisy, of which he died at Pisa on the 10th of March 1872.

His last words were of his country, as he yielded up a life that had been governed by what he himself has called "the sacred, inexorable, dominant idea of duty;" a life which was the type of "the one, pure, sacred, and efficacious virtue, sacrifice; halo that crowns and sanctifies the human soul."

His body was carried across the Appenines to Genoa in a species of triumphal procession, and eighty thousand of his countrymen followed the cold remains of him whom, but a few months before, while the noble heart still beat warm with love towards them, they had allowed to be arbitrarily imprisoned by the king who unworthily wears the crown of that Italy, which, but for Mazzini, would have remained "a mere geographical expression."

Some of my readers may probably have seen Delaroche's strikingly suggestive picture of a "Christian Martyr in the reign of Dioclesian." The body of one of the believers who had accepted death rather than prove unfaithful to the new religion, lies floating on the sullen Tiber. The impotent cords of ignorance and tyranny still bind the tired limbs, but the face bears the impress of ineffable serenity left by the released spirit. The halo of golden light, with which the beautiful superstition of the early Christian church surrounded the heads of its saints, floats over the unconscious clay, and attracted by its brightness, some Roman soldiers standing on the shore are whispering to one another: *Verily, this was indeed a saint!*

Here, symbolised, is the history of Mazzini; the history of the martyrs of humanity from the days of Jesus to our own. The circlet of vulgar kingship crowns

ever the living head, but the halo that illumines the martyr's brow floats only over the solemn tide that bears his earthly presence from amongst us.

"His was, indeed, a tragical life—tragical from the real ills that constantly assailed him—from the lonely thought that ate into his soul, because there were none whom he might inspire with it. . . . . He who bore within himself the soul of Italy, was misunderstood by the whole nation; but he did not yield; he wrestled nobly with the external world, and ended by conquering it. If for some rare moment he seemed to be borne down by the fury of the storm, it was only to rise up again great as before . . . . taking refuge in his conscience; 'beneath the breastplate of conscious purity' . . . he kept himself faithful to his God, to his purpose, to himself. Nothing could bend or corrupt his soul. It was like the diamond, which can only be conquered by its own dust. . . .

"Endowed with an immense power of will, and a patience beyond all proof—inflexible from conviction, and calmly resolute . . . he was of those who recognise no law but that of conscience, and recur for aid to none but God. His soul was naturally loving; but, superior as he felt himself to all his contemporaries, it was the *human species* he loved—MAN, as one day he will be—but with the men who surrounded him, and whom, with a very few exceptions, he did not esteem, he could have no intimate communion. . . . The grand thought of a mutual responsibility, uniting in one bond the whole human race, was ever floating before his eyes; the consciousness of a link between this world and the next, between one period of life and the remainder. . . .

"Life was not sweet or dear enough to him for him

to attach much importance to anything personal, but he loved justice and he hated wrong. He was able to look death in the face without egotistical fear or egotistical hope; . . . it appeared to him of more importance to accomplish his mission upon earth, than to meditate upon the inevitable hour which marks for all men the beginning of a new task. He concerned himself not about the length or the shortness of life, but about the end for which life is given, for he felt God in life, and knew the creative virtue there is in action. He wrote as he would have acted, and the pen became in his hand like a sword. . . . . He was one of those men who pass unscathed and erect through the gravest and most perilous conjunctures, nor ever bow the knee save to the power that works within. . . . . He had gone through every stage of the growth of an *idea*, from the moment when it arises for the first time in the soul's horizon, down to that when it incarnates itself in the man, takes possession of all his faculties, and cries to him, 'Thou art mine.' It was *the dust of the diamond*—the hidden mysterious pain of genius, so real and yet, from its very nature, understood by so few—the torment of having seized and conceived the ideal, and felt the impossibility of reducing it to action in this life—the Titanic dream of an Italy the leader of humanity and angel of light among the nations—contrasted with the reality. . . ."*

Severe and exacting as a stoic towards himself; gentle and compassionate as a woman towards others; beautiful, not merely in regularity of feature and proportion of form, but in the varying expression of his lustrous eyes, and the ineffable sweetness of his smile, Mazzini pos-

* In the above lines, written of Dante, Mazzini has, unconsciously, described himself as no words but his own could have done.

sessed an indescribable personal charm, the magic of which was felt by young and old. For those who knew him not, this meagre record may serve to clear away the mists that have surrounded the purpose of his life. For those who knew him here, my highest hope would be that these unworthy pages might reach their hearts as a sign, even as if their beloved one, on ending the earthly stage of the journey which every human being is bound to accomplish, had paused for an instant upon the last height whence he was visible to their straining eyes, to turn his face towards them, and beckon to them encouragingly with his hand.

ESSAYS BY MAZZINI.

THOUGHTS UPON DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE.

(First published in the *People's Journal*, 1847.)

I.

THE democratic tendency of our times, the upward movement of the popular classes, who desire to have their share in political life,—hitherto a life of privilege —is henceforth no Utopian dream, no doubtful anticipation. It is a fact; a great European fact, which occupies every mind, influences the proceedings of governments, defies all opposition. Whatever may be said to the contrary, no one, now-a-days, sees in the ever-strengthening voice of rising nations, of generations desirous of laying the foundations of a better future, of oppressed races claiming their place in the sunshine—nothing more than the vain imagination of a writer, or the cry of an agitator thrown out hap-hazard among the crowd. No, it is something more serious; it is a page of the world's destiny, written by the finger of God in the heart of these generations whose movement hurries us along. It is the development of that law of which we are but the agents—the law of continual progress—without which there would be neither life, nor movement, nor religion; for there would be no Providence. Friends and enemies begin to own this. And yet, if

the former, salute the development of this fact with hymns of joy, the latter persist in regarding it as something abnormal, as a scourge acknowledged to be inevitable, but against which the human heart is irresistibly impelled to struggle. They are corrupted, you will say, and governed by egotism. This is true of many; but in their ranks are to be found upright men, hearts capable of feeling, but under the yoke of mistaken convictions. Even among the friends of democracy there are men who put their hands to the work with hesitation, and who sometimes appear seized with vague terror. One would say that the echo of that wild cry uttered some ten years since by a statesman speaking of the working classes, "*The barbarians are at our gates,*" still rings threateningly in their ears.

Whence comes this? Do we not all applaud, as did the Romans in their theatre, the prophetic verse of the freedman, "*Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto;*"* when, through the vista of history, we see slavery and its pagan theory of two races of men, fall before the holy words of Jesus, "*All men are children of God?*" Do we not hail, as another great conquest of the divine spirit that ferments in the heart of humanity, that other era in history, when through the Christian doctrine—*we are all brethren,*—serfdom disappeared and made room for the free communes? Why then, instead of rejoicing at the good news that millions of our brethren demand to join with us in accomplishing the world's work, do so many among us turn pale with terror at the signs of the coming future? Do they not call themselves Christians? Do they not repeat, as formulæ of their belief, these words of the only prayer taught us by Christ to the *Father*:—"*Thy kingdom*

* I am a man; I account nothing human alien to me.

come, thy will be done ON EARTH *as it is in heaven?"*

And what is the present movement but an attempt at the practical realization of this prayer? We are labouring that the development of human society may be, as far as possible, in the likeness of the divine society; in the likeness of the heavenly country, where all are equal; where there exists but one love, but one happiness for all. We seek the paths of heaven upon earth; for we know that this earth was given to us for our workshop; that through it we can rise to heaven; that by our earthly works we shall be judged; by the number of the poor whom we have assisted, by the number of the unhappy whom we have consoled. The law of God has not two weights and two measures: Christ came for all: he spoke to all: he died for all. We cannot logically declare the children of God to be equal before God and unequal before men. We cannot wish our immortal spirit to abjure on earth that gift of liberty which is the source of good and evil in our actions; the exercise of which makes man virtuous or criminal in the eyes of God. We cannot wish the brow that is raised to heaven to fall prostrate in the dust before any created being; the soul that should aspire to heaven, to rot in ignorance of its rights, its powers, and its noble origin, while on earth. We cannot admit, that instead of loving one another like brethren, men ought to be divided, hostile, selfish; jealous, city of city, nation of nation. We protest, then, against all inequality, against all oppression, wheresoever it is practised; for we acknowledge no foreigners; we recognise only the just and the unjust; the friends and the enemies of the law of God. This forms the essence of what men have agreed to call the *democratic move-*

ment; and if anything ever profoundly surprised me, it is that so many persons have hitherto been blind to the eminently religious character of that movement, which is sooner or later destined to be recognised. Whence comes then, once more, that instinctive mistrust and even hostility which here, as elsewhere, accompanies every step of its progress? I think it comes in part from terror at the past, in part from the anarchy of the present; but above all from a false, or at least very imperfect theory, which the democratic party themselves have too often assigned as the basis of their activity.

There are men who no sooner hear the name of democracy than the phantom of '93 rises immediately before them. With them democracy means the guillotine surmounted by a red cap. This is just as though we were to judge of monarchy by the horrors recently committed by the Austrian government in Gallicia; or Christianity by the St. Bartholomew and the cold-blooded cruelty of the Inquisition. Others cite the ever-recurring agitations of the small Italian democracies of the middle ages; as if there could be any historical analogy between the *representative* democracy of future times, with its interpreters intrusted with the application and development of a fundamental law, and that of towns where the principle was only adopted in the election of chiefs, where there existed no Constitution directing and binding together citizens and chiefs, and where, consequently, insurrection was the only remedy against abuse of power. The union of the democratic principle with representative government is an entirely modern fact, which throws out of court all precedents that might be appealed to; they have nothing but the *word* in common; the *thing*

is radically different. And as for the horrors which signalized the upstarting—for it was by no means the organization, but the upstarting of democracy—in France, they were exceptional facts which cannot occur again. To say nothing of the progress made in fifty years, and the wholly different temper of the men who now plead the cause of democracy,—there was then a feudal system to be destroyed, of which the characteristics no longer exist except in the north of Europe—a struggle between federalism and the principle of national unity, which has long since been settled in all settled states, and—what is now impossible—a war of all Europe against the country which first hoisted the standard of democracy.

What is real at the present time, and indefinitely obstructs the progress of the principle, is the anarchy which prevails in the camp of its apostles. The democratic party is, perhaps, the only one in Europe which is without a government; which has no directors, and no moral centre in Europe to represent it. We are believers without a temple. We have imbibed from the past so much fear of authority; we dread so much being formed into regiments on the high road; that each throws himself into a bypath, with great danger of going astray. Liberty, which should be but a *means*, has become an *end*. We have torn the great and beautiful ensign of democracy: *the progress of all through all, under the leading of the best and wisest.* Each has snatched a rag of it, and parades it as proudly as if it were the whole flag, repudiating or not deigning to look at the others. One has fallen upon an exclusively political idea. He has his ten pound franchise, or his five points, or something else of the sort: to this he clings; he regards, often with hostility, always with

disdain, those who propose another measure, even if that measure appear to him good in itself; because he is afraid it may divert the public attention from his favourite plan. Another, seizing the merely *economical* part of the question, calculates progress by the number of railroads about to open, of steamers which afford new means of transit, of new markets gained for the national industry; he calls himself a *practical* man, and laughs at political questions and idea-hunting. A third, disgusted with our existing social organization, but disgusted like the child who breaks his toy because he has knocked his head against it, desires to suppress, to annihilate all that he thinks mischievous. He has drawn from his brain a model republic of beavers or of bees; he calls upon the human race to come and frame itself therein, and remain there for ever. Others, again—choice spirits who have intuitively discovered the truth, without troubling themselves much how to impregnate the masses with it—feel great pity for all this; they say; "Man is now sick; above all things he must make haste to get well: he is egotistical; he has only to become again affectionate and devoted: he is sceptical, he has lost the light of faith; he must recover it as soon as possible under pain of death; when he has once recovered health and sight all will go on well." So on, and God knows how many different plans and points of view I could enumerate in the party to which I think it an honour to belong. Below all this the people, without leisure to compare, to study, and to select, among these conflicting ideas, the one which is nearest to and contains the most truth, become accustomed to doubt. For the people there is but one thing certain—their own misery, and the feeling of distrust and reaction produced by it—a feeling which the spectacle offered by their teachers is not calculated to diminish.

Among all these fractions of a party, there is not one completely right, not one completely wrong—they are all fragments of democracy, they are not Democracy. Give the suffrage to a people unfitted for it, governed by hateful reactionary passions, they will sell it, or will make a bad use of it; they will introduce instability into every part of the state; they will render impossible those great combined views, those thoughts for the future, which make the life of a nation powerful and progressive. Develope material interests as much as you please; if moral advancement does not outstrip them, it is probable you will increase the already too great riches of the few, while the mass of producers will not see their condition improved; or even you will increase egotism, you will stifle under physical enjoyments all that is noblest in human nature; material progress alone, *may* end in a Chinese society. As to the Utopists, they forget that we are placed here below, not to create human nature, but to carry it forward; they forget that all the elements of human activity, individual property, riches, etc., are in themselves neither good nor evil: they are instruments with which we may do good or evil. We should anathematize none of them; we should find out how to direct them aright. And as for the moralists, the philosophical writers, who would begin by transforming the inward man—they forget that the labouring man, who works fourteen or sixteen hours a day for a bare subsistence, with no security for the morrow's existence but the labour of his hands, has not time to read and reflect, even if he knows how to read—he drinks and sleeps. It is very difficult to find the *ubi consistat** of the lever of Carlyle, Emerson, and all the noble minds which

* The standing-place.

resemble them, to act on the Glasgow weaver, the *canut* of Lyons, or the Gallician serf.

And yet the suffrage, the progress of industry, the increase of comfort, the co-partnership of labour with intelligence and capital, all these are good, all these will enter into the future, either as the application, or the consequence of the great democratic idea which guides the world. The evil is that each of us having discovered one face of the polygon, one aspect of the human problem, endeavours to substitute it for the entire problem; it is that we persist in endeavouring to amend the details, without troubling ourselves about the principle which governs them. It is that we all, while endeavouring to perfect the instruments and to multiply, as I may say, the materials of life, resemble the economist, who should think he had assured the physical well-being of nations by teaching them how to increase production, without in any way providing for the just distribution of the produce. The threads which should form the social web, become like lost spider's threads, crossing against each other in the air, and at length carried away by the wind.

I have often dreamed of a state of things in Europe when every loving and devoted soul, convinced of the necessity of a creed of fusion—of a general doctrine that might correspond with the now undeniable movement that is hurrying Europe, and with Europe the world, towards new destinies—should act upon the duties imposed by such a conviction. Instead of all these associations organized for one special branch of teaching, or of activity, and which are now separate, strangers to each other, not only in different countries, but in the bosom of the same country—often even of the same town—there should be one great philosophical—I might

say religious—association, to which all these secondary associations should be united, as branches to the parent stem; each bringing to the centre the results of its labours, of its discoveries, of its views for the future. Instead of all these academies, universities, lectureships, etc., without mission, programme, or extended views—and in which, as if to engraft doubt and anarchy upon instruction itself, a materialist professor of medicine jostles a mystic metaphysician, and a course of individualist political economy, follows a course of history or public laws based on the principle of association—there should be one real apostolate of knowledge; starting from the small number of fundamental truths henceforth secured to the human race by the evidence of a few men of genius, but still needing to be made popular. The balance-sheet of our acquirements would soon be struck; and this balance-sheet being synthetically drawn up, the solution of the programme we are all seeking would not long remain undiscovered.

At present we are very far from any such Council of the intellects of Europe. But methinks the time is come to remind those men who desire the general good, of a few simple fundamental principles, which they are in danger of forgetting while carried away by secondary questions and by party spirit.

The suffrage, political securities, progress of industry, arrangement of social organization,—all these things, I repeat, are not Democracy; they are not the cause for which we are engaged; they are its means, its partial applications or consequences. The problem of which we seek the solution is an *educational problem;* it is the eternal problem of human nature: only at every great era, at every step we ascend, our starting-point changes, and a new object, beyond that

which we have just attained, is brought within our vision.

We wish man to be *better* than he is. We wish him to have more love, more feeling for the beautiful, the great, and the true; that the ideal which he pursues shall be purer, more divine; that he shall feel his own dignity, shall have more respect for his immortal soul. We wish him to have, in a faith freely adopted, a Pharos to guide him, and we would have his acts correspond to that faith.

On this object being proclaimed, Democracy says to us—"If you wish to attain it, let man commune as intimately as possible with the greatest possible number of his fellows." It enlarges upon these words of Jesus —*When three or more of you are assembled in my name, the spirit of truth and of love shall descend upon you.* It bids us—"Endeavour all to unite. Invite all to the banquet of life. Throw down the barriers which separate you. Suppress all the privileges which render you hostile or envious; retain only those of intelligence and morality. Make yourselves equal, as far as it can be done. And this, not only because human nature has everywhere the same *rights,* but because you can only elevate *men* by elevating MAN; by raising our conception of life, which the spectacle of inequality tends to lower. All inequality brings after it a proportional amount of tyranny; wherever there has been a slave, there has also been a master; both distorting and corrupting in all those who see them, the idea of life. This idea can only be pure and complete when, taken in all its aspects, it offers nothing abject, nothing vicious, nothing maimed. The Spartans diverted education from its true purpose, and condemned their republic irreversibly to death on the day when, to teach their children

temperance, they showed them a drunken Helot; as we divert it from its purpose when, to teach the inviolability of life, we show to our youth an assassin slain upon the scaffold by society. When all men shall commune together in reverence for the family and respect for property, through education and the exercise of a political function in the state;—the family and property, the fatherland and humanity, will become more holy than they now are. When the arms of Christ, even yet stretched out on the cross, shall be loosened to clasp the whole human race in one embrace—when there shall be no more pariahs nor brahmins, nor servants, nor master, but only *men*—we shall adore the great name of God with much more love and faith than we do now."

This is democracy in its essentials; all other is a petty revolt, a reaction; able perhaps to destroy, but impotent to reconstruct. I know no one bold enough, corrupt enough, to protest against such a programme. But if this programme is indeed that of democracy, is it that of the majority of democrats? Are they, generally speaking, on a level with their cause in their starting-point, or in the object they aim at? I think not; and I propose to show this by reviewing the principal schools which guide the movement. It may be well, after fifty years of struggles, of victims, and of sacrifices, to consider a little where we are; to reconnoitre the ground well, and to examine whether we have not chanced to go astray.

II.

The ideas which have long agitated the camp of Democracy, may, if maturely considered, be classed under two great doctrines; which, again, may be summed up in two words—*Rights* and *Duties*. Their

varieties are numerous; the seeming varieties still more so. Schools which start from the same point and profess to have the same object, terminate, some in a new despotism, others in anarchy; some in the re-enthronement of obsolete faiths; others in vague and mystic aspirations after an indeterminate future: but all are, in one way or another, connected with the doctrine based upon the *rights* of the human *individual*, or with that which is derived from something superior to all individuals, superior to society itself. The former doctrine still rules throughout the ranks of democracy: it has hitherto reigned undisputed in England and America, uncontested save by a few eminent writers, who are little followed.* The second, more recent, and numerically weak, has, nevertheless, since 1830, gained over all the purest and choicest minds of the Continent. I think it is destined to triumph, and to organize democracy under its colours, because it starts from a religious point of view inaccessible to the former. This is sufficient to explain the spirit in which these thoughts will be written. I shall need all the toleration, all the habit of free discussion which distinguishes English readers, for, in examining the school which reposes on *individual rights*, I shall shock many ideas accepted by the majority of democrats; and shall be opposed to illustrious names, whose principles are generally regarded as unassailable. But the question is too serious for the necessity of examining it and discussing it freely under every phase, not to be allowed. I have said that democracy is, above all, an *educational problem*, and as the value of all education depends on the truth of the principle upon which it is based, the whole future of democracy is engaged in this

* Carlyle in England; Emerson in America.

question. No one can wish that it be lightly treated. No one can fail to perceive the importance of an explanation of the views embraced these fifteen years by many enlightened men in France, Italy, and Germany. It is only by a clear statement of all the ideas, all the solutions, and all the aspirations which exist within our party, that we can hope to arrive at truth.

The doctrine which takes individual rights for its starting-point has played, especially in the last sixty years, an important part, highly beneficial to humanity. Arising, or, more correctly speaking, reduced to a formula, at a time when the religious life of nations was still in great measure subject to colleges of priests of whatsoever description, their political life to governments of whatsoever description, their intellectual life to censors, and their industrial life to revenue officers; —it has struck down, destroyed, or undermined all these. It has conquered—whether morally or actually is of little importance, for every moral conquest must sooner or later become actual—liberty of conscience, political securities, and freedom of the press: recently it has conquered free trade. Here is a great and noble part in the history of the world, which can never be denied to this doctrine. But the important question for democracy is not there. *Is that enough?* Are all these conquests the *end*, or are they not rather the *means* to enable us to attain the end? And if this is so, can the principle of the *Ego*, of *individual right*, if laid down as the basis of our moral and political education, can it, I say, guide man, can it associate men for that end, for those ulterior conquests? That is the question. Whoever examines things at all seriously, will perceive that the doctrine of individual rights is essentially and in principle, only a great and holy

protest in favour of human liberty against oppression of every kind. Its value, therefore, is purely negative. It is able to destroy; it is impotent to found. It is mighty to break chains; it has no power to knit bonds of co-operation and love.

Suppose you have before you men, free, emancipated, conscious of their faculties, acquainted with their rights, with God's universe open before them. What use will they make of their liberty? In what way will they employ their faculties? Whither and how will they direct their march? Is not this question—the vital question for the human creature—still untouched? The doctrine of *rights* has given men ability to act; but what will now be their action? Is not this the problem of which we are seeking the solution?

Suppose you have before you nations strong and great; freed from all the fetters which prejudices, class interests, or the hostile ambitions of a few reigning families had cast around them. What use will they make of their freedom of action? Will they establish their nationality upon broad and active sympathies with truth, beauty, and justice, or will they wrap themselves up in a narrow nationalism? Will they strive to encroach upon the rights of others, to absorb, to monopolise all power? Will they perceive that national and international life ought to form only two manifestations of one and the same principle, the love of what is good? Will they, in a word, take as their motto, *the weakening of all which is not ourselves;* or, *Amelioration of all by all;* the *progress of each for the advantage of all.*

This is the question which democracy desires to solve; for democracy is not the mere liberty of all, but *Government freely consented to by all, and acting for all.*

What the world thirsts for at present is,—whatever some may say,—*authority*. All its insurrections are directed, not against the idea of power, but against the parody of that idea: against a phantom authority; a lifeless shape, henceforth barren and incapable. We desire to be guided; only we wish the best and wisest among us to be our guides. We desire to be associated as closely as possible in a common union in pursuit of a common object; only we wish this union to be freely accepted, this object not to be a fragmentary object, the object of a single class or part. And far from delighting, as so many believe, or pretend to believe, in disorganization or anarchy, democracy—like the world, whose moving spirit it is at present—thirsts for unity; but, inspired by bitter experience, it declares that henceforth no unity is possible where an artificial inequality reigns; where a spirit of domination on the one hand, and of distrust and reaction on the other, prevent all community of ideas, and parcel out humanity into distinct classes, by giving them different interests.

The doctrine of individual rights is so incompetent to solve the question as I have here laid it down, that it is terrified at the idea of government. Its supporters regard government as a necessary inconvenience; to which they submit, on condition of giving it as little power as possible. In their theory, government, reduced nearly to the functions of a police constable, deprived of every initiative, has no mission but to *prevent*. It is there to repress crime and violence; to secure to every individual the exercise of his rights against any brutal attack of his neighbours—nothing more. And lest, seduced by the sweets of the power deposited in its hands, it should attempt to overstep these narrow bounds, they surround it with suspicion, with mistrust, with

hostile local powers; they devote their whole study to organize a system of guarantees against its possible encroachments. Here is, properly speaking, no society; nothing but an aggregation of individuals, bound over to keep the peace, but for the rest following their own individual objects; *Laissez faire, laissez passer*, is the formula of the school.

This is not the ideal we seek; no, certainly, it was not to attain the ignoble and immoral *every one for himself*, that so many great men, holy martyrs of thought, have shed, from epoch to epoch, from century to century, the tears of the soul, the sweat and blood of the body. Beings of devotedness and love, they laboured and suffered for something higher than the individual; for that Humanity which ought to be the object of all our efforts, and to which we are all responsible. Before a generation which scorned or persecuted them, they calmly uttered their prophetic thoughts; with an eye fixed on the horizon of future times, speaking to that *collective* being which ever lives, which ever learns, and in which the divine idea is progressively realized; for that city of the human race,* which alone, by the association of all intellects, of all loves, and of all forces, can accomplish the providential design that presided over our creation here below. We are all responsible to and for one another. We all live for others; the individual for his family, the family for its country, the country for humanity. We all seek the Law of our life; and with us (as in all that exists), the law of the individual is discovered only in the law of the species. We are all climbing a pyramid, whose base embraces the earth, and whose point rises towards God: the ascent is slow and painful,

* *Civitas generis humani*; the expression of all great men from Tacitus to Dante (*De Monarchia*), from Dante to Bacon.

and we can accomplish it only by joining all our hands, by aiding ourselves with our united strength, by closing up our ranks, like the Macedonian phalanx, when any of us fall exhausted by fatigue. Herein, in this necessity, lies the legitimacy of democracy, of its aspirations after the emancipation, the elevation, the co-operation of all: herein, also, lies the secret of its inevitable power —inevitable as the accomplishment of the designs of God.

But if from these heights, where all human desires become purified; where the efforts by which we strive to transform the medium in which we live, receive a religious consecration—you bring democracy down to the narrow arena of individual tendencies; giving it mere individual rights for weapons, and a mere theory of liberty for its aim, without a higher common rule of action; you change its all-embracing, all-sanctifying nature into a something reactionary and hostile; you destroy its organic thought, its eminently social instincts, its thirst for general education, for belief and for unity of direction, to substitute for these a nameless species of peaceful anarchy, in which man will begin by the worship of individuality, and will fall by degrees into the abysses of egotism. And in the meantime you excite, and in some measure justify, the terrors and repugnance of the society you are desirous to gain over; you unconsciously sow hatred; you alienate from us many superior minds,* who think democracy barren, godless, and consequently impotent.

I am aware that many who adopt the doctrine I am refuting will be astonished at the consequences I deduce

* *e.g.* Thomas Carlyle, a democrat by every instinctive tendency, denies democracy a future, because he confounds it with the school I am combating.

from it. They dream of the future much as I do; they examine their own hearts, and find that they are ready to devote themselves for others; for the future propects of humanity; for the development of social instincts; for all that I declare to be the final aim of democracy. These men are better than their doctrine: their heart is better than their head; it *feels* the *collective* life of humanity—it communes with it; that feeling hurries them into a practice which contradicts their theory. But what assurance have they that others will do what they do? We have to do here, not with the actions of individuals, we have to test the value of a *principle* to be our guide in general education; we have to do with the influence which that principle may exercise on men already more or less corrupted by an education received under the state of things we desire to abolish, or by a total absence of education.

You speak, some will say to me, of unity of belief, and consequently of education; you condemn our distrust, our system of guarantees; our theory of liberty. Would you entrust the national education to the existing powers? Would you entrust to societies founded on privilege, the initiative of future progress? And ought we, for fear of anarchy, to incur the risk of despotism?

God forbid! The struggle for liberty is as sacred as human individuality: maintain it to the last. Wherever Government—corrupt or behind the age—has no true educational mission, beware of giving it one: surround yourselves with guarantees, so long as you can do no better. Only do not elevate into a final theory that which is but a sad temporary necessity; do not limit the problem to a mere overthrowing of obstacles. We are clearing the ground in order to raise a new edifice. We need liberty, as much to fulfil a *duty* as to

exercise a *right;* we must retain it. But if you give to your political education a higher religious principle, liberty will become what it ought really to be—the ability to choose between various means of doing good; if you enthrone it alone, as at once *means* and *end*, it will become what some juris-consults, copying paganism, have defined it to be—the right to use and to abuse. It will lead society first to anarchy, afterwards to the despotism which you fear.

Suppose the rights of one individual temporarily opposed to those of another, how will you reconcile them, except by appealing to something superior to all rights? Given the right to increase their wealth, recognised in all, how will you solve, without appealing to another principle, the great and persistent question between the workman and the manufacturer his employer? Suppose an individual revolting against the bonds of society: he feels himself strong, his inclinations, his faculties, call him to a path other than the common; he has a right to develop them; and he wages war against the community. Consider well, what argument can you oppose to him consistently with the doctrine of rights? What right have you, from the mere fact that you are a majority, to impose upon him obedience to laws which are not in harmony with *his* individual rights and aspirations? Rights are equal for all: society cannot have one more than an individual. How, then, will you prove to that man that he ought to confound his own will with the will of his brethren? By imprisonment? By the scaffold? That is to say, wherever society has not given education, *by violence.* Suppose one of those solemn crises which threaten the life of a country, and call for the active devotedness of all its sons—a foreign invasion, a violent attempt to substitute a tyranny for

the fundamental laws of the state—some great and indispensable progress to be won for a suffering class, is it in the name of rights that you will call on the citizen to dare martyrdom? Is not the first of rights the right to life? You have taught him that society was constituted for the sole purpose of securing to him *his* rights; and now you demand of him to sacrifice them all—to suffer, to die for the safety of his country—for the progress of a class which perhaps is not even his own! No; he will calculate the risks and the chances of success, and act accordingly; or he will declare himself a cosmopolite—will say—as, in fact, has been often said —"*Ubi bene, ibi patria!*"* he will carry his at his shoe-sole, and you will have no right to address to him a single reproach. The man has only been logical—consistent with the principle of the education you have given him.

Alas! what an historical commentary could I, the native of an enslaved country, append to the words I have just written! How much devotedness have I seen fade at the breath of adversity in the last fifteen years! How bitterly have I often repeated, while contemplating these living ruins, the verse of Shakspeare—

Oh, what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!

Young men had risen, burning with youth and pride, indignantly shaking off the chains imposed on their intellect, on their conscience, on all their faculties, and swearing they would fight and suffer unrestingly for the national cause. But without a firm belief in the *duty* of devoting themselves to the general cause; without a religious conception of human life; urged by the spirit of reaction and the instinct of their violated

* Where I am well off, there is my country.

rights, rather than by a social inspiration, how could they keep their promise? Two or three years' struggle exhausted those strong resolutions. Exile and persecution took out all the bright colours of the flag they had followed, instead of giving it the sacredness of misfortune. Disappointed hope filled them with a barren bitterness; and at every abandonment, at every desertion, they said to themselves—"*Why struggle for beings so corrupt?*"—not seeing that it is because men are corrupt that we should strive to change them. By degrees they allowed themselves to be influenced, to be ruled by the atmosphere which surrounded them; they began to reckon what they lost in the struggle; they found that, for the uncertain gain of a few rights withheld, they risked the loss of their material career—of life itself, the source of all rights. Scepticism seized them, enchained them with its serpent coils. When it had subdued them, it transformed itself into egotism. Thus, saddest of all sad sights, I saw them die the death of the soul. Those only who, taking up the cross of suffering and struggle, had calmly bidden adieu to *individual* life, to its joys, its dreams, its azure hopes; sad, but resigned; blighted, but not crushed by the tempest, remained erect.

And tell me, when you look at the nations which enjoy more or less liberty—tell me, O my friends in the struggle—whence comes this incessant, ever-growing complaint of the *people*, of the laborious classes, of the millions who toil and suffer? Is there not here an energetic protest against the impotence of that incomplete doctrine which makes the *individual* at once means and end? Take France, for instance. There, for sixty or seventy years, this doctrine has had its philosophers, its moralists, its apostles, its warriors, its

triumphs;—1789, 1830. Liberty has been won; the doctrine of individual rights has been incarnated, one may say, in every man. Why do so small a number profit by it? Why have the wrongs of the working masses remained nearly the same? Why have the revolutions directed by the middle class, by the bourgeoisie, been productive for that class alone? The bourgeoisie fought only for rights: it has remained faithful to its principle; and, *its own* rights once won, it felt no need to extend them. The masses have remained excluded from the conquest. What becomes of *rights* for those who have no *power* to exercise them? What becomes of liberty of instruction for him who has no time to learn?—of free trade for him who has neither capital nor credit? To prevent the doctrine of rights from becoming a bitter irony for this man—and the name of this man is million—the middle classes should have thought of abridging the hours of labour, of raising wages, of giving a uniform and gratuitous education to the multitudes, of bringing the instruments of labour within the reach of all, of establishing a credit for the talented and honest working man. They have not thought of all this. And why should they have done it? Why should they have limited the exercise of *their* rights for the benefit of others? The lists are opened: 'tis enough—let him run the course who can. The men of 1830 are now called apostates in France: this is wrong. They have, I repeat, only been logical. They honestly opposed the government of Charles X., because it was directly opposed to the class from which they sprang—to their right of thought, every instant violated—to the right to a share in the government, which their education, their talents, their callings, gave them. These rights won, they rested.

Can you, *according to their principle*, require more of them?

A great man, an Englishman, who in his own person sums up all the labours of the school, has replied by anticipation in the affirmative. He has given to the doctrine of individual right the support of a principle which he declares inherent in human nature, and which merits a separate examination.

III.

Bentham—the distinguished man to whom I alluded at the end of my second article—has given to the doctrine which I oppose as condemning democracy to impotence, the support of a Principle which he thought identical with human nature. His *critical* power, the multitude of his labours, the universality of the applications he made of the principle, and the clearness of his method—for this, in my opinion, is Bentham's great merit—render him, not the founder, but the real head of the school. Throughout all its numerous transformations—the study of which contains a complete refutation of the principle—St Simonians, Fourierists, Owenites, Communists, are all found to be followers of Bentham. They differ as to the employment of the means—as to the organization which is to ensure the triumph of the principle; but that principle is the same with them all—*utility*. Man has a right to happiness here below: *well-being*, the *greatest possible happiness*, is the object of all individual and social labour.

I know that the theory of *rights* does not find favour with Bentham by name; but for all who understand the spirit, and not the mere dead letter of Bentham, this is evidently only a quarrel with the word; or, to

speak more correctly, a quarrel with the manner in which rights were understood when he began to write. Those were the times of Blackstone: the right spoken of, by whatever name it was called, natural or other right, was a something indefinite, malleable, which was identified with I know not what primitive, unwritten contract between the nation, the aristocracy, and the monarch. And he, the man of written law, a mind fond of codifying in the smallest detail; he who very justly denied the existence of that contract, and who considered the legislation and organization of society radically bad, was irritated by the very name of *right*, and has somewhere called it the greatest enemy of reason. But ascending to a more elevated sphere than that of Blackstone, or of any other temporary application of right—the two schools which I have called those of Right and of Duty, are distinguished precisely by this, that one takes for its starting-point the *individual* man; while the other starts from a Collective idea;—from the idea of the mission of humanity,—to trace the path of the individual.

Bentham's writings recognise no idea superior to the individual; no collective starting-point; no providential education of the human race; no progress of all towards the realization of an ideal standard of excellence. An understanding more fitted to sound the depths of a single idea, than to grasp many from an elevated point of view; nourished from his tenderest youth with the doctrines of Helvetius; evidently devoid of all religious sentiment, and disinherited of the common inspiration of humanity by his contempt for the past—how should he have dwelt upon anything but the sensations, or the instinctive sympathies and antipathies of the individual? Bentham, then, viewed with regard to his whole ten-

dencies, belongs to that philosophy of the last half of the eighteenth century, which, in the name of individual feelings and rights, proudly stood forward against the falsehoods of a society grown lifeless, and which, though able to destroy what existed, and to throw out promises for the future, was powerless to realize them.

Man, then, is a being susceptible of pleasure and of pain. To seek the former and avoid the latter is the law of his being; to calculate well, his wisdom. Society may facilitate and guarantee to him many pleasures; it may avoid for him many pains: its object is to organize every thing with a view to the greatest happiness principle for all. In this way the public interest will be identified with private interests. The acts from which the greatest number of pleasures are derived, will be virtuous; those which produce most pain, will be vicious. This, if I am not mistaken, is a dry, crude, but faithful enunciation of the doctrine of Bentham—and of two-thirds of the democrats of the day—in its essence.

Its incompleteness as to knowledge of human nature, its omission of all the finest, noblest, most elevated capacities of our soul,* its forgetfulness of the supreme law of the collective world—the continual progressiveness of thought;—the very vagueness of this word *utility*, which receives a different interpretation from every individual, and according to time and place—are things with which I have here nothing to do. The powerlessness of the principle to produce the social transformation which we all invoke, is the point to which I wish to draw the attention of my fellow-labourers. A complete estimate of a man like Bentham cannot be even sketched in two or three pages.

* See Bentham's *Table of the Springs of Action.*

Now, I can understand that in face of a society founded on privilege, organized with a view to a monopoly of enjoyment by the minority, one should say as a protest:—"*No: society ought to see to the well-being of all.*" To have said this boldly and without reservation, is the glory of Bentham. But to come to a party which assumes to found a future; which in its convictions is already emancipated from all veneration of privilege and monopoly; which demands from its chiefs an *educational* principle for the society to come; to say to such a party—"*Teach utility, the love of pleasure, and the abhorrence of pain,*"—this is what I own I cannot understand.

What! we desire to be a reforming, renovating party; we are bound to be more noble, more high-minded, more virtuous—for thence alone we can derive the legitimacy of our efforts—than the men of the party we oppose; we complain that at every step we meet with egotism; we deplore the systematic warfare to which unbridled competition, without any higher regulating principle, has reduced society; we are continually speaking of fraternization, association, and love;—and to remedy these evils, to realize an ideal superior to that which now exists, we seek our weapons in the arsenal of the enemy; we say, "*That flag under which the heart of the privileged classes has become narrow, withered, and sterile, shall be ours: we will enlarge it, so that it shall cover us all with its shade!*"

To attain our object we must go back to principle; must re-attach the nations, which now go about groping their way in empty space: to the laws of progress; to humanity; to God: we must raise the now fallen moral sense; must revive a sentiment of duty in the heart of these men now sunk into calculating machines; we

must hold out a worthy object to our thinking youth, who, born in the midst of ruins, fall so soon into doubt and discouragement; we must reconstitute the moral existence of man by enthusiasm and love: the old existence founded on privilege and inequality is now only dust and ashes. And shall we pretend to do this, and to get men to follow us, by saying to them, "*Weigh pleasure and pain in the balance, and choose between them?*"

Let us see: it is certainly the present time that we are forced to take for our starting-point. It is no new-born generation, starting from beneath the mantle of Bentham, gifted with his good intentions, warmed by his Utopian philanthropy, that we have to teach. No; it is the world which swarms around us—suffering, enjoying, competing, coveting, envying: it is the existing society, with its masters, its servants; its men who have everything, and its men who have nothing. You have, on the one side, a minority which possesses by right of inheritance, by aristocratic tradition, all the elements of wealth—land, capital, machines; on the other side, the majority, possessing only its hands, its power of labouring, and reduced to hire this out on the terms imposed by the former, on pain of death by famine. And to these two classes, you, who would transform society, present the word *utility*, the greatest possible *well-being*. How will you reconcile these conflicting interests? The utility of the landowner is to sell his corn for the highest possible price—the utility of the manufacturer is to produce the most at the least possible expense. What suits the one is monopoly, the prohibitory system: what suits the other is the lengthening of the day of labour, and the greatest possible diminution of wages. How will you, without sacrifices and

privations, reconcile these two utilities with that of the workman, which requires not only the assurance of an abundant return for his labour, and the acquisition of hours in which to develop his intellectual, and satisfy his moral faculties; but which must inevitably urge him to seek a progressively increasing share of the profits with his employer? There is clearly no question here of a balance, of something correlative in matter of interest. The question is one of concessions and privations on the one hand—of gain on the other. By what arguments will you convince the former that for them utility consists in sacrificing a part of their enjoyments? By placing before them, you will say, the security they will thus acquire for the remainder; for if they refuse to do this, they will run the risk of losing the whole by a commercial crisis, by a famine, by an insurrection of the working classes. I know it well; but, honestly, do you think the uncertain future has much share in the calculations of the individual? Do you think the vague prospect of the scaffold has prevented many assassinations? Do you think the prospect of a future revolution enters much into the calculations of the statesman who upholds a despotic government? Have we ever seen the fear of a glut hinder many traders from throwing their goods into newly-opened markets? No; man in general calculates his utility for the duration of his own life; he willingly repeats for his private behoof the saying of the diplomatist—"*After me the deluge;*" or if he goes so far as to notice a black spot rising on the horizon, he says to himself—"Let us wait and see; if the storm come, we will then look to it."

You have—the example has been quoted already, but to me it appears striking—you have an inheritance to divide. Divide it, says the system by the voice of

Bentham, so that the subsistence of the rising generation shall be secured; the pains of disappointed expectation shall be prevented, and the equalization of fortunes promoted. How so, pray? What measures will you take, so that, in this country where I write, there shall be no disappointed expectation either on the side of the eldest born, or of younger sons? How contrive in any country that there be no disappointed expectation on the part of the generation that is passing away, or that which is rising up?

I know that there will be loud outcries against this: the utility, it will be said, that we have in view is the *general* utility: it embraces future generations. The landed proprietor, the head of a manufactory, must feel that the question concerns not *their* interest, but that of all; the first-born will not think his expectation disappointed because an injustice has not been committed: man should desire, as far as possible, not *his own* well-being, but equality of well-being. *Should?* And why? Do you not see that you are appealing to another principle?—to a religious principle? Do you not see that you have invoked something superior to all the individualities that constitute your society; something superior to all the laws that you can promulgate in the name of utility—viz. *Justice?*

Again it is said, Justice and Utility are identical: Justice is the idea—Utility is its symbol, its outward sign. By preaching the latter, then, we by implication preach the principle. Yes; Justice and Utility are identical to the *world*, but not to the *agent*; in their final, but not in their intermediate results. In the eyes of all who can penetrate great historical events, the Crusades struck the first blow at feudalism; they were providentially directed to further the progress of hu-

manity. Does this prove that the thousands of crusaders who fell by famine and the sword in Hungary and Greece, before they could kiss the dust of the tomb of Jesus, reaped any earthly advantage on their way? The fall of the Roman Empire, again, was providentially an advance in the progress of the species; in the only way in which they then could draw near each other, the north and south of Europe came into contact, and by their shock prepared the way for a vaster world than the Latin world. Can we say that the millions of Italians, pillaged, crushed, enslaved by those who were then called Barbarians, would not have had a right to protest in the name of Utility against the law of circumstances which imposed martyrdom upon them? Utility, a higher degree of material and moral well-being, is always the *last* consequence of a great revolution, of a great justice accomplished; but how many tears, how much bloodshed, how many sacrifices, to attain it! The instinct of human responsibility, the instinct of Justice, may induce a people to sacrifice one or two generations on the field of battle, or in the slower and less brilliant martyrdom of civil struggle, of moral suffering; but who will say to it: "*In the name of thy own advantage, sacrifice thyself! in the name of thy well-being, die?*"

The obstinacy with which men perseveringly cling to an idea, often to a word, when once adopted, has something in it astonishing: one would say that, like the shipwrecked mariner in the immensity of ocean clinging to a fragment of wood, as to a plank of safety, so the human mind, struck with fear of falling into the void gulf of scepticism, seeks to make of that word, of that fragment of an idea, a plank to which to cling. I have known souls eminently religious, whose every feeling was stamped with the poetry of faith; whose every

thought was an aspiration after infinitude;—persevere, perhaps in consequence of a reaction against the God sectarians had painted to them, in denying God, and in making of the great and beauteous universe a lifeless machine; a huge body without soul, floating over the abyss of annihilation, between Chance and Fatality. I have many times met with utilitarians in theory—sincere, ardent, enthusiastic—who accepted all our belief in duty, in sacrifice, in a collective advance on the great paths of progress, and saying to me—"*That is what we desire,*" without seeming even to suspect they had, speaking logically, no right to do so; that they could not spring from individual advantage to general utility without introducing into their theory a third term—superior to the former two—which is not in it, and which, if introduced into it, would break it to pieces. Their heart taught them better than their understanding; or rather, their understanding had, without acknowledging it, long since abandoned a theory too lightly adopted: the word alone remained with them; and that word annoyed and fascinated them by turns; that word persecuted them like Frankenstein's monster, demanding of them a soul; they wanted to give it ours; they would willingly have introduced Plato, the man "who talked nonsense," into Bentham. They acted like our Neo-catholics, who seek to introduce Liberty beneath the infallible mitre of the Roman Catholic Papacy.

But, let me conjure you my friends, think what you do. Here the question is not of you, but of all;—of those now living, with their corrupt inclinations, their want of moral vitality—of those who shall come into life, a tablet virgin of all impressions, a white leaf without written characters, calling on you for a Principle

of education. And this principle of education can only be *a definition of human life.* Is life a sensation, a succession of sensations? or is it one finite manifestation of the eternal Idea which is developing itself progressively through temporary forms? Is it a simple *fact*, without antecedents or consequences? or is it a *duty* to be fulfilled? Is it the search for happiness here below? or is it the accomplishment of a mission—the search for, and successive realization of, the ideal; of the divine Thought which presided at our birth, at the birth of those milliards of worlds that roll harmoniously around us, and are destined to form a concord, of which we shall gradually learn another and another note as we advance? Will you say to the young, will you say to your children—"*Calculate pleasures and pains?*" or will you repeat to them that beautiful saying of one of our party*—"*There is but one sole virtue in the world—the eternal sacrifice of self?*" Will you intrust their young spirits to the barren, godless formula of interest; or will you explain to them that great saying of Jesus—*Let him who would be the first among you make himself the servant of all?* This is what you are called on to determine. But in deciding, forget *yourselves.* Look to men such as you have them in general around you. Do not—because *you* live with our life; because, unknown to yourselves, you breathe the morning breeze of the day that is about to dawn—do not pretend that all which is found at the bottom of your heart arises spontaneously in the heart of the millions. Do not say, because you are ready to see your utility in martyrdom, that the Glasgow workman and his master, the Irish labourer and the middleman, the child who works in the mine and he who with a rod prevents him from

* Georges Sand.

falling asleep, will not find theirs elsewhere. *Martyrdom!* Your theory is disinherited of it. It cannot impose it on the individual in the name of his well-being. Jesus is unintelligible to it: Socrates, if it be at all consistent, must seem to it like the *nonsense-talking* Plato, a sublime fool. There was, at the bottom of his cup of hemlock, something more than a calculation of pleasure or a disappointed expectation.

What I am about to say does not appear very scientific, but I could wish people would submit to take the answer to the problem from the words of any good mother to her child. There, in that primitive instruction dictated by love, and in which God reveals himself by sudden illuminations that are worth many volumes—there, I think, will be found the condemnation of the principle of utility as the basis of education. Mothers know, and we also know it, that if happiness here below were the object of life, our world would be but a sad failure.

The life of man is a journey, the end of which is elsewhere. Like the flower, it has its root in the earth, and must force its way through its element to blow in a subtler element—air. Pain and pleasure, happiness and unhappiness, are the incidents of the journey. The wind blows, the rain falls, the traveller fastens his cloak, sets his hat on firmly, and prepares for the struggle; at a later time the storm passes off, a ray of sunshine breaks forth and warms his numbed limbs: the traveller smiles with pleasure, he thanks God in his heart. But have the sun and the rain changed the end of the journey?

Bentham and his school have taken the incident for the object. To speak more correctly, they have seized one of the results of a principle, and have said, "That is the principle itself." They saw that with every great

moral progress of man, with every great conquest of the spirit of association and love in history, there corresponded, sooner or later, a material amelioration, an augmentation of comfort; and from this providential fact—which is but *one of the means of verifying human progress,* and which, I repeat, is almost always realized when the immediate agent has disappeared—they concluded that we have only to make of this fact the basis and the object of life. They began the problem at the end, and attempted to poise the pyramid on its apex. Their conduct somewhat resembles that of the child, who maintained that the two expressions—*to eat to live,* and *to live to eat*—were identical. How did they fail to see that, by substituting the fact for the principle, they deprived themselves of what alone can produce the fact?—that, in order to realize it, a society is needed, ready formed and immutable, imbued with the principle?—that, setting out with private interest, they must end either by making egotists, or by the absurdity of pretending that the private interest of the individual is realized in the interest of those who shall live after him?—lastly, that one may indeed give an apple or a cake in the evening as a reward to the child who has occupied his day industriously and well; but that, if one were to think of saying to him, "*Thy object is the cake or the apple,*" one should run the risk of seeing the child rob the neighbour's shop or garden as soon as he hoped to do so undiscovered? Here there would be but one reply—repression; and one would say that Bentham instinctively felt this when he commenced the series of his labours by organizing the Panopticon. But what sort of educational principle is that which is founded on repression?

No; it is not by speaking of interest and pleasure,

that Democracy will remould the globe; it is not by a theory of utility that we shall make the sufferings of the poorer classes and the urgent necessity for a remedy *felt* by the well-lodged, well-clothed, and well-fed classes. It is possible you may make them think your theory very ingenious; but between that and *action*, between that and devotion, is an abyss which you will never fill. Man, some one has said, is quite willing to admire knowledge, but on condition that knowledge shall not derange a hair of his head. So sweet is careless ease by one's paternal hearth, in the midst of smiling faces, when the storm blows without, and the driving rain beats against the strong panes of the window!

There were utilitarians, also, about the time of the fall of the Roman Empire. Their formula was then *panem et circenses*—bread and amusements; and under the reign of that formula, accepted by the people, Rome, devoured by the gangrene of egotism, rotted and perished. Jesus came. He endeavoured not to save the perishing world by analysis. He spoke not of their interest to men whom interest had degraded. He laid down, in the name of heaven, some unknown axioms; and these few axioms *did* change the face of the world. A single spark of *faith* effected what all the schools of the philosophers had not even a glimpse of—a step in the education of the human race.

IV.

St Simonianism is no longer to be reckoned among the fractions into which our democratic camp is split; for some years (and in this devouring epoch, ever eager to reach the goal, each year is equal to a quarter of a century), it has been dead, buried, and forgotten. But

it was the most important, I will venture to say the most advanced manifestation of the spirit of new things that breathes through the era. It has sown on our soil many more truths, many more large and productive ideas, than all the socialist schools which I cited in my preceding article. And it was, moreover, in my opinion, the boldest and sincerest attempt men have hitherto made to realize in practice the fundamental principle of Bentham's idea; to organize society from the point of view of *utility*, and when it fell—lost in those contradictions into which logical consistency irresistibly hurried it—it proved to us the impossibility which I have pointed out, of producing the *general well-being* by setting up individual rights and comforts as the object of life. Thus St Simonianism was useful to us in its death, as well as in its short but brilliant existence. No doubt it may often have deserved severe blame, but never indifference. And those who had only a smile of contempt for it in its development, and who consigned it to complete oblivion after its fall, appear to me very far from feeling the sanctity of earnest thought, and unable to comprehend the signs of the times and the real wants of existing humanity.

What! I hear it objected—Utilitarianism and St Simonianism! Bentham and Père Enfantin! what an association! How can you class in the same category, how couple in discordant union, the practical, positive spirit of the one, and the vague mysticism of the other; a pretended religion, and, we might almost say, a jurisprudence; a theory of freedom, and a dogmatical despotism? I am about to tell you. But, first, let me point out in a few words in what the St Simonianist manifestation was truly important. Let us, now that the danger is past, calmly appreciate the good, the noble

side of the school. The inferences I wish to deduce from its fall, will be only the more striking. In these sketches, moreover, the first object of which is to promote, as far as is in my power, a more serious consideration of the question of the epoch, to solve which is the business of democracy—I could not, without remorse, pass over the graves of our dead, of those who died for us, without addressing to them a few words of gratitude; without establishing the fact that their work is connected with ours; that they still survive in us in all their better parts. We pass but too quickly at the present day from foolish admiration to ingratitude. We often accept, without too much examination, the systems which *live*, or appear to live; we examine not at all the systems which have fallen. With us death is equivalent to condemnation. This doctrine, we say, is dead, therefore it had no right to live. There is something of truth in this; but why should we not say also,—this doctrine has lived, therefore it had a right to live? it represented a want, it destroyed an error, it stated an essential question, though without solving it? On this earth all dies and nothing dies. Forms fall without recovery, but there is always something immortal in the idea, in the spirit that produces these forms. And it is that something which constitutes the great stock of human knowledge; the arsenal from whence we draw our implements to open our forward path. We must not forget this. The *vixit, obiit:* it has lived, it has perished; no longer satisfies us. How was it enabled to live? Why has it perished? This is what we require to know, under pain of being condemned to isolation and doubt of all that preceded us in this world. Founded on a sort of religious conviction, St Simonianism offered to our eyes a spectacle exceedingly rare—I would almost say unique

—of harmony between the thoughts and actions of a numerous association, composed of men of powerful intellect, of men in trade, and of simple workmen. In an age when the immoral distinction between *theory* and *practice* is but too often the rule of life; when men of *thought* and men of *action* in general stand anxiously apart from each other; when the religious and philosophic question and the political question proceed on two parallel lines—the St Simonians arose and said: "We *believe* in what we say, and, consequently, we will not only preach, but practise it." They perceived that man is only complete through unity of thought and action; that thought is the germ of action, the wide-spreading tree under which the generations seek shelter. In the midst of a sceptical race, accustomed to the Jesuitism of expediency; smiling at the movements of enthusiasm, and too often refuting an idea by an epigram—they boldly confronted persecution, and, what is still more terrible, ridicule; they did not draw back from the mocking laugh which their costume, their rites, and their social household life, drew from the Voltairians of Paris; they even uttered words of peace, when brutally stoned by the Catholic populace of the south of France. It was a right noble spectacle; which, I own, excited my admiration to the highest degree, and which often led me to defend them warmly against the accusations lightly cast upon them by men fresh from a banquet or a court-levee, who had not even taken the trouble to read their writings. This also was in a great measure the secret of their strength and of their rapid progress from 1830 to 1832: the people found in them what it found nowhere else, what it finds nowhere at the present day—convictions and acts; *living books*, if I may be allowed the expression,

and not mere thinkers; the nucleus of a Church, not a mere *sect* of philosophers.

They had, I have said, understood Man completed by Theory and Practice. They understood him also—and this is the second cause of the profound impression they made—complete in the wants which agitate him. They sought to embrace the whole man. At the present day, by dint of analysing, dividing, and sub-dividing, the unity of man has almost entirely disappeared. As, before the unity of God was revealed by Moses, pagan polytheism had broken it up, parcelled it out into fragments, making of the One Creator so many separate divinities—so the materialist analysis of modern times, by whatever name it is called, has broken up and parcelled out the human being into his several faculties. Religion, art, production, politics—all these proceed separately, independently, often in opposite directions. "I," says one, "have heaven; what matters your earth to me?" "Let us agree," says another, "on earthly matters; as to heaven, let each believe as he pleases." "Man is a producing being," says the economist, and he proposes to himself, as the unique, exclusive problem, the augmentation of production; let the *agent* die under his labour, provided the *thing* is made. "Man," cries the socialist, "is a being who consumes," and he busies himself only with the distribution of riches. To arrive more speedily at absolute equality, he takes away all that stimulates man to increase more and more the common fund; without suspecting that he incurs the risk of arriving at equality of indigence, instead of equality of wealth. Some, in the name of human liberty, organize the war of the strong against the weak; others, in the name of the superiority of what they call the religious principle, allow of progress in

some branches of human development, and affirm the immutability of others. And the issue of all this is a society, which proclaims itself *indifferent* collectively, and *believing* in each of its members; which maintains its right to *punish*, and abdicates its right to *educate*; which preaches *sacrifice* by its religion, *enjoyment* by its policy; and confides the collective development of the association to simple individual liberty.

The St Simonians felt the radical vice of this society. They felt that man is *one*—religious, artistic, a producer, a consumer; a being at once free and social; that the unity of his life depends upon the superiority of a dominant Principle, directing all these faculties, all these applications of activity; that if there is any means of making him advance, it is by making the entire man advance. They gave a solution to the religious question, at the same time as to the social, industrial, and artistic questions. This solution was in many respects incomplete, and it was false in others; but the idea of the necessity of one solution of *all* the questions was true; and that truth, in the midst of men and of doctrines which at that time mutilated human nature at their caprice, was a great step towards the future. And indeed those who accepted the solutions of the St Simonians felt themselves calmer, more contented, more devoted, than in any other school. They felt not that uneasy void which torments men's minds at the present day, and prevents them from devoting themselves to those reforms of detail which their understandings approve.

Moreover, their system comprehends both the democratic principle and the principle of association—the one, it is true, at the base rather than at the summit of the system; the other, violated by the too marked

distinction between the hierarchical classes; but still they were there. The moral, intellectual, and material improvement of the most numerous and poorest class, was explicitly assigned as the object of the doctrine; and by this the merely political programme of the liberal party was transformed into a social programme, in which everything was arranged for the people. The association of forces and capacities was substituted for that impassible theory of *free unlimited competition*, which organizes war, and leads inevitably to the victory of those who *have*, over those who *have not*. From the St Simonians came the first serious attack against an economic system, which people still persist in regarding as a doctrine; while it is at bottom only a scientific exposition of the existing fact, without value for a better future. And Père Enfantin spoke truly when, proclaiming the dissolution of the society, he said to the innovators, "*Now you will all of you subsist upon fragments of our idea.*"

There is much St Simonianism, avowed or otherwise, in the political economy taught at the present day out of the old official school. The formula—*to each according to his capacity, to each capacity according to its works*—was indisputably superior to every other then known. Employment given to merit, and according to the special nature of the merit; reward according to the importance and difficulty of the work; this is certainly the point towards which we are tending by a slow progressive change. Society, as it exists, is ruled in general by the formula, *to every one according to the class to which he belongs; to each class according to the means or capital which it possesses.* It provides neither for justice nor for the collective advantage. It substitutes, so to speak, matter for spirit; and must

inevitably break down before the growing power of intellect more equally diffused.

To this, I think, is limited the good contained in St Simonianism, and it is quite enough to demand gratitude from us all. By this it lived—by this it is indissolubly connected with all the progress made since then, and with all that shall be made. Let us now see *why* it died; died for ever as a doctrine and as an attempt at social organization.

St Simonianism did not perish, as is generally thought, in consequence of the exposition Enfantin made of what he called its morality. That morality was radically vicious in its principle; and hideous in its details. But the decline had begun before that exposition. Many desertions had already taken place; and, moreover, if the germ of death had not already existed in the heart of the doctrine itself, the St Simonians would have repudiated the strange revelation of Enfantin as an individual aberration, and saved the society by a change in the hierarchy. The true cause of the death of St Simonianism was its social organization. Born of the democratic outburst of 1830—for before 1830 the St Simonians were a mere nucleus of philosophic writers—it was false to its own origin. It sinned against Liberty, whose breath had given it life. Issued from a principle, *the good of all*, it by degrees substituted itself for the principle. Instead of saying *all through the people*, it contented itself with saying *all for the people*. Having imagined a certain form for the realization of the principle, it ended by confounding that form with the principle itself, and pretended to force humanity into that form as into a frame. It took society in its arms, if the expression may be allowed, and endeavoured to transform it by transporting it into another *medium*,

elaborated, not by society itself, but by the system. It is the error of all socialists. They forget that we are here below to continue humanity and not to create it; and humanity, which desires to walk on its own legs, and with full knowledge of all it does, avenges itself by passing on and withdrawing its life-breath from the makers of Utopias. They all die, or will die, of spiritual inanition; shut up in their model convents. And thus died St Simonianism, very fortunately for us; I say fortunately, for its death furnishes a new proof that the future belongs to us alone; to those whose sole desire is to place the people in a condition to open for themselves the path of progress, beneath the eye of God.

How did St. Simonianism come to this? I will answer this briefly, guiding myself in all that follows by the opinion, somewhere expressed, of a friend whom I honour and love, of M. Pierre Leroux. I entirely share his views on that point; and his opinion is doubly precious to me, because it is the opinion of a man who was an ardent St. Simonian before the schism provoked by the morality of Enfantin; and because it is my object to give my readers not only *my* ideas, but, as often as the occasion offers itself, those of the principal democrats of the Continent.

Bentham was, in a great measure, the chief inspirer of St. Simon: *utility*, the greatest happiness principle, was his starting point; the conciliation of individual with general interests,—his goal. The name of Bentham was cherished by the first who grouped themselves around the chief: some of them endeavoured to make his ideas known in contemporary publications. They did not much repeat that somewhat vague name *utility*: like men who would not be mere copyists, but who

aimed at being improvers, they substituted for it the more definite one of *production:* and they christened by the name of the *Producteur* their own first periodical, anterior to 1830. But the fundamental idea, the soul of the system, was the same. Utility was their *aim*, production the *means*. Like Bentham, the writers of the Simonian *Producteur* concentrated their labours chiefly on material interests; like Bentham also, the bearing and tendencies of their first writings were rather irreligious and devoid of ideality. When at a later period these changed, utility or production did not the less remain the dominant idea. Their religion was the religion of enjoyment; they desired less to raise earth towards heaven, than to bring heaven down to earth; and there, in fact, their dogma ended. Everywhere, in what they somewhat coarsely called the *rehabilitation of the flesh*, in their appreciation of art and artists, in their theories of woman and love, in their valuation of accomplished works, not by the purity of the motives or the labour or suffering of the agent, but only by the degree of utility produced by them, Bentham's idea, more or less disguised, is always visible. I am convinced that those who seriously study St. Simonianism will not contradict me.

So long as the St. Simonians remained in the sphere of theoretical writers, their task was simple; no great practical difficulties gave the lie to their assertions and philanthropic hopes. It was different when, carried away by the impulse of 1830, they attempted to become the conquerors and reorganizers of society: then all those difficulties rose before them, threatening and imperious. To such as proceeded from all the moral wants, from all those vague aspirations, indistinct, but inseparable from man, which economical theories can never satisfy,—

they replied by endeavouring to raise themselves to the height of a religion. But the impossibility of reconciling general and particular interests from the point of view of *utility*, drew them into a path diametrically opposed to that which they had at first adopted, and, at length, out of the stream of humanity.

After all sorts of attempts, these men, indisputably powerful by their intelligence, perceived that should they give as a motive-principle to men such as they were, such as they are, their *individual* interest, they would create egotism; and by it, sooner or later, usurpation, war, inequality; resulting in crises, insurrections, anarchy. They felt that, by making *collective* utility the base of their edifice, they should be very often forced to sacrifice the rights of the individual; to call upon him, so to speak, to commit suicide for the benefit of society; and consequently to establish a despotism, whether in the name of intelligence, or any other name. They boldly made their choice, and entered unreservedly on the second path.

In their manner of regarding history,—which I think very defective,—that of dividing it into periods of unity, called by them *organic* periods; and *critical* periods, or periods of liberty; they had already learnt to mistrust the eternal element of progress, and to concede none but a dissolving activity to liberty; they sacrificed it. They had found in Plato (*Republic*) the division of men into men of appetites, men of heart, and men of intelligence; they adopted this division, and made of it their *learned* or *priests*, their *artists*, and their *industrials;* and (forgetting that above this trinity there is the unity—*Man*, a compound of intelligence, of heart, and of appetites,) they made of them the three classes, I had almost said the three castes, of their society. *They* had conceived

the idea; they then were naturally the *learned*, the *priests*, the only persons capable of realizing it; they assigned therefore to themselves and their successors the first rank, the direction of society. They forgot that if the initiative of great things often comes from above, the impulse is always given from below; they forgot that if there really exist, by divine right, superior capacities, and if it is good that they should govern, it is on condition that they shall represent, sum up, and elaborate the thought which lives obscurely, confusedly in the masses; for without that they may be Utopists, they will never be able to realize. They forgot that the visible sign of that communion of thought can be found only in the suffrage, in the elective right given to the masses; and they broke the bond of union by organizing their hierarchy from above downwards. They said to themselves—we are the ministers of God; the highest capacities will still be such after us; they shall fill up their numbers by electing one another; they shall govern—and this was all their democracy—for the benefit of the greatest number; the inferior capacities, artistic and industrial, shall apply *their* thought in the ranks assigned by them.* From thence to an infallible Papacy, there was but one step to take; they were too logical not to take it; for among all the superior capacities there must necessarily be one superior to all; and they took the step. They elected a high priest, a *Père* Enfantin, and a sacred college around him. It was the Pope and Cardinals of Catholicism over again. Humanity, which has ceased to believe in a Pope and Cardinals, felt no desire to begin again; it went otherwhere; and the St. Simonians, after having shut themselves up in a convent at Menilmontant, disappeared from the

* Rodriguez, *Letters on the St. Simonian Religion.*

arena for ever. A short time afterwards, the last of the faithful, the forty who accompanied Enfantin in his retirement, retained of St. Simonianism only the primitive motto, Utility, applied only to material interests. At the present time they are almost all zealous servants of the government of Louis Philippe. Michel Chevalier writes in the *Debats*:—Enfantin directs I know not what railway works.

Man does not wish anyone to think for him; he wishes to have the path of thought thrown open to him, so that he may think for himself. He demands instructors; but rejects, and will always reject, guardians; from whencesoever they come to him. The St. Simonians perished, because they forgot this simple truth. We have seen by what difficulty they were hurried into that forgetfulness. We shall see how the same difficulty hurried the Socialist schools which succeeded them into far other errors.

V.

I HAVE shown how the St. Simonians, having hoisted the standard of Utility—of the greatest-possible-happiness principle—as the end and aim of our earthly life, found themselves, when once placed face to face with the two interests, the *individual* and the *collective*, obliged to give a preponderance to one or the other; how it was the collective interest which they chose; and how, from one conclusion to another, being led to the despotism of authority and the negation of human liberty, they finally disappeared; disowned by Humanity, which lives by progress, and consequently by liberty. Almost at the same time (one might almost say in order that the demonstration of the impotency of the principle

might be complete) Charles Fourier was carrying the same standard on a diametrically opposite route. With him, also, *happiness* was the end of human life—*pain*, a sign of error; *pleasure*, satisfaction, a sign of truth;—*interest*, the great lever of re-organization. But, more capable of probing an idea to its last consequences, than of elevating it, by purifying it, to its highest expression, to its original source;—strong in detail, but weak in all that regards the conception of the unity of humanity;—destitute of science; disinherited of all poetry of heart; incapable of feeling the sacredness of the collective progress of the human race—he finished by seeing only the *individual* in this world; by adoring liberty alone; by laying down to himself, as the only problem of life, the means of giving to the individual full and entire satisfaction. It matters little that he has continually spoken of unity, and that he has inscribed as a motto at the head of all his works that law of *attraction* which was reduced to a formula by Newton, and the possibility of the application of which to the phenomena of the social world had been revealed to him by St. Simon.* His unity will be found, by every one who examines his doctrine to its foundation, to be nothing but the application of his theory of the *individual*, to *all* men. His *attraction* is not, as it is for us, a sign placed in our hearts by God to teach us that it is *only* through the harmonized labour of the whole great human family towards an end superior to its actual life, that we can comprehend and apply our law: it is for him but a means and a necessity of present *pleasure*. The idea of a social mission, of the *duty* of moral progression, and,

* *Lettres de Geneve*, 1802. *La Theorie des quatre mouvements* did not appear till 1808. The numerous plagiarisms of Fourier have been at last placed beyond all doubt by the beautiful work of Pierre Leroux.

consequently, of an authority; is entirely foreign to Fourier. He has nothing which represents it in the edifice constructed by him with such minute and laborious care. He has no reality of government: his omniarchs, his kings, his emperors, his goddesses,* are mere phantoms—a simple satisfaction given to the passion of ambition. He knows no religion. "Philosophers have always sought social good in administrative and religious innovations:" he applies himself, on the contrary, to seek it only "in operations having no connection whatever with these matters, by industrial modes." He has no ideal of virtue to pursue: he tells you that "for politicians and moralists" (disciples of the *uncertain sciences*, as he calls them, the *nonsense-talkers* of Bentham) "the last hour has sounded."

What remains, then, for the basis of his society? What is left to this man, who, in the intoxication of what he calls his discovery, deprives himself so lightly of all that has been hitherto the subject of the labours of humanity? There remains for him *happiness*, the happiness of the individual; and know you what he understands by happiness? "Happiness consists in having many desires, and many means of gratifying them." Later on he will tell you that "it consists above all in the possession of riches." "After all, are not riches the means which guarantee to the individual the liberty of satisfying his desires?" And from step to step, from consequence to consequence, Fourier, fascinated, blinded, by his thirst for happiness, the only end which he recognises in our earthly career—and by the worship of his idol liberty, the only instrument that

* Let those who would verify our statement, read his *Theorie des quatre mouvements*: all that we insert between inverted commas is drawn from that.

he knows by which man may attain it—arrives at *discoveries*, at rules of social management, which his disciples, less bold, endeavour to make us forget; which I have not read without a blush upon my brow, and which I could not transcribe here without pollution.

There is in the first part of Goethe's *Faust* a scene which almost all critics have declared unintelligible; it is that which represents the witches' kitchen. There you see male and female apes, and impure and nameless creatures, rolling a ball, warming themselves by the fire on the hearth, breaking a crown, and singing the burden of a revel-chorus. The pivot on which the scene turns is a cauldron. They watch it, and they skim it; they say that they are making *beggars' broth.* And in the centre of all this, Mephistopheles, the genius of evil (portrayed to perfection by Retzch's design) is seated at his ease, throned like a king in the midst of his court. Here is the *happiness* of Fourier. It is the triumph of matter; the earth a prey to the selfish appetites; life reduced to the mean proportions of animal instincts and propensities. I never re-peruse this scene without recalling to mind the moral theory of Helvetius, and the chapters (*premières periodes, ou les sectes confuses, desorganisation des sectes, tribu à neuf groupes, etc.*) of Fourier, which are its practical development. He also, he might tell us, is preparing *beggars' broth.* Every man eats in his system, nine times a day, I think; *every man is to consume a mass of eatables equal to the twelfth of his weight.;* he is to work a few hours at some short, varied, and agreeable employment, his own choice: the remainder of his time he will float from pleasure to pleasure. He may, if such be his taste, pass from one woman to another in the *papillonne;* if he is born a conspirator, he will

intrigue in the *composite;* his *only* law will be that Otaheitan fancy, as he calls it, which will, uncontrolled, possess and traverse his brain, overwrought by sensualism. Does he wish for luxury? The phalansterian world, with a population of three thousand millions, will furnish him with as much as the rich possess to-day. Does he desire a yet greater degree of luxury? The three thousand millions have only to be reduced to two. This is what Fourier terms *le petit complet* (the reduced totality) of the world; and—let but the majority sanction it—he will furnish them with the means. He will reduce by artificial means two-thirds of women to sterility. This is Malthus crowned with roses, and squeezing out the juice of the grape!

You say, all that is horrible:—true; but it is at the same time perfectly logical.

Fourier takes upon himself—urged, I will nevertheless say, by the love he bears to his fellow-men—to resolve the problem of life. He feels truly that man cannot be born to suffer eternally, and that, his law once accomplished, happiness must be his destiny; but, destitute of the religious sentiment, and not believing in the progress of the human being, except here below, Fourier has only this earth wherein to accomplish human destiny, and attain to happiness. Placed between the *collective* and the *individual* interests, shall he choose the first for the basis of his labours? Others have already done so. From their experience and by his own genius, he comprehends at once that he must, by taking their basis, arrive, sooner or later at the absolute triumph of authority; at the violation of human liberty. This liberty is sacred to him; he will preserve it at any price; he adopts, then, for his starting-point the interest of the *individual.* Nevertheless,

he needs for his guidance a link which shall attach him at some point to human nature; a philosophical principle, a positive test, or criterion of truth. Where shall he find it?

There are three things, three lives, if I may so express myself, in man. There is that by which he is united to humanity, and holds communion with it—his participation in *collective* life, his place, his value, in the history of our race; there is that by which he holds communion with himself, sometimes, may I say, with God—his *Ego*, his individuality, his conscience; there is, lastly, that by which he holds communion with the physical world—his body, his instincts, his wants, his appetites and desires. It is evident that in adopting for his criterion the first of these three manifestations of human life, he must at once find himself driven to that universal will, that authority which he repudiates. Shall he then take conscience as his criterion? But what is the conscience of the men who surround him, and whom he wishes to render happy, if it is not the production of that education which they have derived from all the previous labours of humanity, of the *medium* in which they have been living? What is their Ego (individuality), if it is not the result of the influences belonging to the corrupt epoch which Fourier condemns to death? In order to discover the inspirations of individual conscience, pure from every influence, he must go back beyond the historic period, to the commencement of our species, to that time when the individual, hardly developed at all in his moral nature, only reveals his Ego by his sensations. And what will this process leave him but the third human manifestation—the body; sensation, the capacity of pain and pleasure? There he stops. He is obliged

to do so. He mutilates man by taking from him head and heart, and then sets himself to study and anatomize what remains. He finds under his scalpel, wants, instincts, appetites: are not these, then, the key to the intention of the creating power? He throws a disdainful glance over the world's history; everywhere, in all times, he finds the animal propensities at work; and everywhere, in all times, legislators, moralists, and religions, assuming to enchain, repress, and mortify them. "Behold," says he to himself, "the capital error. They annihilate a work of God, and they deny an eternal element of humanity!" His own indignation is a ray of light for him; his world is discovered! "*I have destroyed,*" he cries, "*twenty ages of political imbecility;*" and he thenceforth takes the appetites of man for a guiding principle in his researches. He does not ask himself if these *propensities* are anything but instruments, which do not act by themselves, but which depend upon a superior power, and which produce good when directed by self-devotion, and evil when directed by selfishness. He does not see the mind above—*Man* claiming his exclusive attention. He takes the means for the end and the starting-point at the same time, and he says to himself: "*Man is an animal* with certain *propensities*, or rather *those propensities constitute the man: they are sacred; our mission consists in giving them full and entire satisfaction.*" There you have, in effect, the whole theory of Fourier. "It confines itself," he says, "to utilising the desires, *such as Nature gives them,*" and without seeking to change them in any respect. That said—all is said. The Otaheitanism of Fourier is but an affair of detail easily to be foreseen. Everything is allowed, everything is legitimate, in this

world abounding in impurity, without education, without morality, without a common faith, without martyrs, without an altar, and without a God.

Yes, I repeat, Fourier is a powerful logician. I have very often, shuddering the while, been grateful to his unpitying logic; never drawing back, clearing all, accepting all, diving into the most impure hiding-places to possess itself of a consequence from the original principle. It has taught me whither this theory of *happiness*, which reappears in history every time that strong faiths disappear — every time that the link between heaven and earth is broken—must lead its disciples. And if, to repulse this doctrine, I could not summon to my aid the whole history of the human race, the theoretical and practical teaching of all its saints, and the immense aspirations of the soul — far, far superior to all power of realization on earth,—the world which Fourier's logic has drawn from the principle, would suffice for its refutation.

The world also is led by logic. And if you, pure and devoted souls, should be tempted, by the fervour of an inconsiderate love, to cast before the generations of to-day —weak, enervated, and hesitating, like all those which arise between the tomb of one social system and the cradle of another—this theory of earthly *happiness* as the end of existence—they will go, I warn you, sooner or later, where Fourier has gone; they will commit suicide upon all the noblest elements of their nature, and degrade themselves at their ease in the worship of material interests, for which alone the theory can furnish any view of organization; they will go, like Faust, to search for the elixir of life in the witches' kitchen.

We also would make *beggars' broth*; we desire that man may be enabled to develop himself in the plenitude

of all his faculties, moral, intellectual, and *physical*; but we know that it can only be by placing before him, for his object, as Carlyle says, not the *highest happiness*, but the *highest nobleness possible*; by elevating in him the idea of the dignity and of the mission of humanity; by rekindling in him, through faith and the example of devotion, the expiring flame of self-sacrifice—by teaching him to appreciate and to love more and more the joint life of all his brothers in God—that we can approach more nearly to that condition. Remove this, or but make it subordinate in your plan, and you will do nothing. You may preach the well-being of *all*, but you will succeed only in creating egotists; who, as soon as they shall by chance, or by a greater aptitude in the chase, have snatched their quantum of happiness, will entrench themselves as in a fortress, ready to fire upon all those who would traverse the same path by which they arrived. You may achieve commercial liberty —the liberty of competition; but you will not prevent the crushing of the weak by the strong; of the labourer by the capitalist. You may found *phalansteries*; they may endure, while they exist merely as model systems, and amongst you, whose inspirations unceasingly protest without your knowing against the theory: but they will fall the moment you seek to multiply them. You may glut your man with the good things of the earth—you may open to him every possible way of finding a recompense for his labour in the love of women; he will desire the good things due to his neighbour's share, and the woman who has vowed her love to another. You have spoken to him of the legitimacy of his instincts; and thither his instincts, excited by some inappreciable influence which your organization has been unable to foresee and prevent,

compel him. You have told him to *enjoy*; you cannot now say to him, Thou shalt enjoy in such and such a manner; he chooses to enjoy after *his own* fashion—to satisfy his appetite, which is, in fact, his whole being. This for the many: the few chosen souls gifted with an exceptional power of love and of sorrow, will curse your *happiness*; which here below is but a bitter irony to every nature that aspires; they will go far from you into the solitude of concealment, to utter the long cry of suffering which burst from Byron at the beginning of our calculating and sceptical century, and which so few men have as yet understood.

There are two things in Fourierism, and I hasten to admit it before I conclude, that I may not deserve to be taxed with injustice. There is a theory of life and a practice which results from it; it is of this which I had here to speak; for I wished to show how the doctrine of *interest*, when starting from the *collective* point of view, results in the despotism of authority; and ends, when it adopts the *individual* point of view, in the anarchy of animal propensities. There is also an organization of agricultural, industrial, and household labour, founded upon association, which deserves to be profoundly studied, and which, there is no doubt, will furnish to futurity many important views, and many more practical details than any other school now known. Its examination does not belong to this series of reflections. And moreover, the time in which it will be needful to appreciate the numerous contingent, material ameliorations which the disciples of Fourier promise to a future society, does not appear to me to have arrived. I repeat, the *moral* man must first be re-made. And if I have a complaint to address now to those good and devoted men who are labouring to extend the thoughts

of their master, it is only on the sad illusion which induces them to believe that when they have succeeded —if they ever should succeed*—in organizing a phalanstery, they will have organized humanity entire. "No, brothers," I feel tempted to say to them, "do not exaggerate: it is not humanity—it is only the kitchen of humanity, which, perhaps, you will succeed in organizing. But I know of no great architect who commences a *chef d'œuvre* by the kitchen."

If I were here to discuss the phalansterian scheme upon its practical ground, I should not, I believe, find any difficulty in proving that, unless the whole earth could be, at any given time, at once completely organized in a series of phalansteries, it could never be so, permanently, in any part of it. I fear rather, that with actual organizations and tendencies, the first country that should peacefully constitute itself into phalansteries, would meet with foul play on the part of the usurpers of Cracow, or other hands. But, as I have said, that is not my ground. Man stands higher than the earth which bears him. He lives on its surface, and not at its centre. His feet are upon it, but his brow is raised to heaven, as if he would elevate himself thither. There, on high, brightly shining in the serene Heaven, or hidden by the dark clouds of misfortune, is his polar star. He aspires from the depths of his soul towards a future which he can never reach in his present form; but which is the object of his life-activity; the secret of his being; the guarantee of his progression;—and each great epoch of humanity renders this aspiration more intense, and adds a new light to the conception which he forms of this future. From every new light

* Two attempts, the one at Condre-upon-the-Vosges, and the other at Citeaux, have already failed.

springs a new social renovation,—a new earth in the likeness of that new heaven. I do not know, historically speaking, a single great conquest of the human spirit; or a single important step towards the perfectioning of human society, which has not had its root in a strong religious belief: and I say that every doctrine which regards not this aspiration, which does not contain within itself a solution, such as the time may afford, of this supreme necessity of a faith; of this eternal problem of the origin and destiny of humanity —is and ever must be powerless to realize the conception of a new world. It may succeed in organizing magnificent forms; but the spark of life, which Prometheus snatched from heaven for his statue, will ever be wanting in them.

VI.

After St Simonianism—which, in aiming at social happiness, destroyed individuality;—after Fourierism—which, in aiming at the happiness of the individual, suppressed the parent-idea of society, of the mission of power;—there remained but one other step which could be taken on the path of materialism—to deny both the one and the other;—to organize society, after the manner of bees and beavers, upon a fixed, immutable model, and upon the foundation of absolute equality; so that nothing should remain for power to do, save to repeat continually a series of identical acts; —nothing for the individual, except to maintain the productive activity of the soil.

This step was taken, and communism is its result.

Communism, the last fraction of European democracy, has acquired, by its numbers, a certain importance in

the camp. In France, in a part of Switzerland, and in Germany, it has won over to its teaching considerable numbers, belonging particularly to the working class; whose intelligence, but little developed, has naturally, in the isolation in which they have been left by the thinkers of the party, welcomed this system as the least complex; the most simple and the most efficacious method of relieving the immediate evils of which they have to complain. It has penetrated quite recently into Poland.* Its strength has doubtless been purposely exaggerated by the European police, and by all the interested opponents of the democratic principle. Whether powerful in numbers or not, communism will never be able to aspire to the honours of a revolution; it cannot aim higher than an *émeute*. Only intelligence causes revolutions, and communism cannot reckon a single vigorous thinker in its ranks. Its existence, I repeat, is owing only to the fatal line of demarcation marked out by facts in our camp, between the men of thought and the men of action—to the isolation in which democratic intelligence has too generally left the working class. The day when the chiefs shall mix themselves with the soldiers—the day when the democratic writer, instead of concentrating his thought in a book which the millions do not read, shall diffuse it in friendly conversations in the workshops where his brother men labour and suffer—communism will disappear.

To-day, however, it exists: it disunites us; it draws unmerited accusations upon all democratic opinion; it

* I by no means intend here any illusion to the Manifesto of Cracow, which owes its reputation of communism simply to the inaccurate translations of the German papers, and to the calumnies of M. de Metternich. It is absurd to believe that a National insurrection can ever raise the standard of communism.

enlists in its ranks men of good faith; loving men, whose hearts, ever ready for self-devotion, are worth more, not only than *their* heads, but than the heads and the hearts of many of those who affect to despise them. The slight sketch that I have attempted of the ideas which furrow here and there the field of democracy, would not therefore be complete, if I were to pass over Communism in silence. There is, besides, always something of value to be detected by observing these ebullitions of the party; were it only a great protest against a vicious social state; were it only a homage implicitly rendered to the great principle, so long misunderstood, of human brotherhood and association. It must not be forgotten that at another great epoch of renovation; between the last convulsions of Paganism and the first Christian hymn, communist tendencies directed the young social ideas of the new believers.

I have said that Communism denied both the individual and society. It does deny both the one and the other in their constituent vital elements—liberty, progress, and the moral development of the creature. Wavering between St. Simonianism and Fourierism, it borrows from the first its tyrannical tendencies, its inevitable violation of individual liberty; from the other its law of the satisfaction of the *inclinations*, which it would reduce to *wants;*—in vain, since every strongly felt inclination constitutes a real want to him who feels it: it exceeds them both in its absolute contempt for the past, for all historical tradition, for all manifestation of the previous life of humanity.

St. Simonianism, recognising the importance at least of the religious problem, offers its doctrine as a continuation of that of Jesus. Fourierism, in its exaggerated and exclusive worship of human liberty, recognises at

least the sacredness of one of the essential elements of the creature. Communism at once abolishes religion by indifference, and liberty by the immovable absolutism of its formula of organization. On such a day and year, one or other of its chiefs found beneath his pillow the world's secret; the only plan of practical organization which is fitted for it. Humanity may date its commencement from that day; not before. That day also its destiny was accomplished; for there is not in reality any more collective progress possible for it. These chiefs have constructed its dwellings; they have traced its functions; they have prepared the cells in which each of its members must fix and incrust himself for ever. All that has hitherto constituted life, and caused the development of the human race, is gone by. All the grand problems by which human intelligence has been agitated, through, perhaps myriads of ages, are become perfectly useless. Communism repeats the phrase of Omar—"Either all that you say is in the Koran, and it is useless; or it is not there, and it is dangerous;" and it annihilates with the stroke of a pen all the elements of humanity hitherto recognised; all the manifestations of human life from the beginning of the world.

You study in history the successive transformations of the institution of property; you are upon the point of arriving, through the experience of past ages, at the grand principle that property ought to be the sign of human *labour*. You are pursuing a useless study. Property must soon cease to exist.

You speak of the fatherland: you endeavour to prove how, the nation not being henceforth the property of kings, the dynastic possession of some princely families; but the closest association of a fraction of humanity, to

attain by *special* means the *common* end—all hostility, all jealousy, between nations ought to cease: you maintain that this common end being the progressive development of *all* the powers, moral, intellectual, and physical, of the human being, *all* ought to assist therein, and that a great alliance should embrace all countries, and organize them according to their peculiar tendencies; precisely as we endeavour to arrange individual aptitudes in a workshop. Lost labour! the abolition of country, of nationality, is a fact, if not accomplished, yet decreed.

From the right of life and death, given to the father in the *family* of past ages, down to the legislation springing in great measure from the French Revolution, you follow the development of the principle of equality in the family; and you console yourself in anticipating the moment in which, women's equality being also recognised, the mother and the father will rule without distinction amongst the children,—the family—to form of it a nursery of citizens for the state, which in its turn will transform them into active labourers for humanity. What is the use? Under the communist *régime* there there will be no *family*; there will only be *females* bringing forth children; the community will take charge of the rest. We have changed all that.

I know that many Communists do not go as far as this; and that, after having demolished the fatherland and property, they pause, seized with a sort of modesty, on the threshold of the sanctuary of the family. They want courage or logic. They suppress the nation and property, because the selfish principle is enthroned on their present organization; but does that principle crouch less close to the hearth-stone than to the fence which marks out individual property; or to the foot of

the fortress which defends the frontier of the nation? Is it not all the more dangerous there, inasmuch as it covers itself with a more sacred veil, and makes its appeal to the instincts of kindred? But since you recognise in the war that you would wage with the selfish principle; no issue but death; no remedy but extermination; why be pitiless in the one case, merciful or weak in the other? And is there not between these three terms—family, fatherland, humanity—a close and indissoluble relationship? The family, is it not the germ of the state—the nation; as the state, the nation, is the germ of humanity? Are they not the three steps of the ladder which leads up from man to God; three successive and progressive manifestations of human nature; three stages of the same idea; a realization, more and more complete, of the providential plan which governs us? Either these things are all sacred, or not one of them is so. Each one being organized with a view to the others, you cannot suppress any one of them without by so doing suppressing what constitutes the essence and the life of the one which in the order of nature precedes it; the end for which that one exists.

And now, upon this desolate waste—whence, together with all that has caused the sorrows of humanity, all that has proved the source of its glory and of its progress has also disappeared—what does communism propose to organize? with what will it give *happiness* to men?

There are several varieties in communism; but it may be said broadly to have only two systems. A government at once proprietor, possessor, and distributor of all that exists—funds, capital, instruments of labour, produce; every man working, in some way or other, a

certain number of hours, and receiving either all that his *wants*, whatever they may be, may claim; or, according to another system, a share of the produce *equal* to that which each of his companions receives:—here is the essence of the communist theory. The remainder is only detail.

It is clear that the system of *absolute* equality in the distribution of the produce of labour is unjust, unrealizable, and inevitably leading to that which it pretends to suppress. It destroys all appreciation of talent, of virtue, of activity, of devotion in the agent; all appreciation of the quality of the labour. It supposes an equality, which does not exist, in all the fruits of the earth; in all the productions of industry. It is, besides, inefficacious for the end which it proposes to itself; for he who economises in his consumption to-day, will be rich to-morrow, and inequality will reappear through him.

But the thesis of distribution according to wants is not less unrealizable. Can we, by any effort of imagination, suppose a government capable of estimating exactly the wants of all the individuals composing society; capable of determining correctly the vocation, the capability of each; and of assigning to each his labour, his function; capable of directing, of overlooking the labourers; of collecting and of administering the productions of their labour; unless by a number of officers equal to that of the labourers themselves? To each according to his wants, say you; but what constitutes a *want?* Is it that which the individual himself shall declare to be so? It is evident that the obligation to labour will be avoided by a crowd of fictitious wants—such as travelling, for example. Or will authorized power charge itself with the definition? Can you imagine a more frightful tyranny?

Tyranny! It is at the root and at the end of communism, and pervades it throughout. It makes of man, as does the cold, dry, imperfect theory of the economists, nothing more than a producing machine. His free will, his individual merit, his never-ceasing aspiration towards new modes of life and progress, entirely disappear. In this society, petrified in form, regulated in each detail, individuality has no longer a place. As upon the plan of Spielberg, which Francis the First had made for his royal occupation, man gives place to a cypher: he becomes number one, two, three, &c. It is the life of the convent, without the religious faith. It is the serfdom of the middle ages, without the hope of redeeming —emancipating—one's-self by economy.

The best among the communists reply, You must devote yourself. Devote yourself to whom? Do you not impose the sacrifice of their liberty upon *all?* And if not upon all, have you then a caste of masters—of directors, and a caste of labourers? This word devotedness is a sort of fatality for all the schools which pretend that the object of our earthly life is *happiness.* They have endeavoured in vain, since the beginning, to discard it as hostile to the tendencies of human nature; it has reappeared, indispensable, inevitable, at the end of all their Utopias of happiness; as the sentiment of the infinite rises upon the horizon of all our joys and sorrows. The conviction of their own powerlessness leads them, one after the other, so to speak, to our feet; to the deeply religious idea that we preach, and which they have it so much at heart to avoid. Nor can it be otherwise; either they organize their communes with men corrupt, selfish, covetous, as they at present find them under their hands, offering them only the attraction of happiness, the promise of satisfying all their wants, all their

appetites;—and in this case, the first drought, the first scarcity, the first blight,—such as that which has struck the potatoes,—will destroy the Utopia; the community will become for such men a community of suffering; each will isolate himself—if he is strong, he will make open war upon a society which does not hold to its own engagements—if he is weak, he will steal;—or else they presuppose that it is of the essence of the community that each man should bring there an idea of devotedness; a belief that he must be ready to sacrifice himself for his brothers; that he is not here for his pleasures, but in order to accomplish a work, to execute a law; and are they not then obliged to come to us, to commence by regenerating man, by appealing to an education, and consequently to a Principle superior to each of the individuals composing their society? And what is a principle superior to all the individuals, if it is not a religious principle? How can we call upon men to recognize their fraternity, without going back to a common father? How make an appeal to a superior law, without referring to the law-giver!

Yes; it is an educational problem with which we have to do; it is to regenerate man in his ideas and in his sentiments; it is to elevate and enlarge the sphere of his life. And it is in the forgetfulness of this idea that the vital error of the communist lies; as well as of all the sects wrongfully called—as if the principle of association did not belong to all Democracy—Socialists. They take for the subject of their studies and their efforts, the *world* and not the *man*: the house and not the living being who must inhabit it. They patch, plaster, or rebuild. Our habitation, the universe, they say, is badly furnished; badly arranged: too much air enters on one side, too little on the other; there is too

much embellishment above; too much nakedness below; we will do better. And they set to work, each with his design—his programme. They raise, with the stroke of a wand, sumptuous palaces, magnificent parks; galleries which enchant the eyes. Alas, alas! for whom do you build all that? It may be that I admire your galleries; but where is the artist soul who will derive his advantage from them? Your parks are perhaps in the newest taste; but the savage whom you are going to place there will destroy their beauty in the twinkling of an eye.

There is not the meanest poet whose imagination cannot, in certain moments, build ten Utopias similar to yours; but they will always remain impracticable, unless man is first of all raised to their level. I remember how our own Campanella painted for us, in the seventeenth century, in his *City of the Sun*, a magnificent Utopia; in which are to be found the germs of St Simonianism, of Fourierism, and of Communism. I do not see that his brother Italians, corrupted by servitude and by Machiavelism, have profited by it. I still read with admiration and respect that magnificent Republic of which Plato dreamed at the moment when the Greeks were giving the hemlock to Socrates; but what traces has it left on the Greece of the Roman conquerors, in that of the Lower Empire, or of the Crescent?

It is man, it is humanity, which builds its own dwelling—transforms its own medium; which the Utopist may foresee, but cannot create. The social arrangement of the external world is only the manifestation of the interior man; of the moral and intellectual condition of humanity at a given time; of its faith above all. Society, such as we have it at the present day, is the result of the want of an act of common faith; of the anarchy which reigns amongst intelligences and interests;

and of the selfishness inevitably resulting from this anarchy. Until all this is changed by the promulgation of principles, and by the association of intelligences, you will accomplish nothing durable or efficacious. Change that: all will then change in the twinkling of an eye; and man, believe me, will find no difficulty in providing himself with a fitting dwelling-place.

And in order to perfect this habitation for himself, man will not have occasion to destroy either fatherland, family, or property—like the savage of Montesquieu, cutting down the tree to gather the fruit—like the child who breaks in his rage the toy against which he has hurt himself. He will content himself by transforming them; by developing them in the right direction; by enlarging the circle in which they move; by stifling the selfishness which corrupts them at their source. It is this that the world has at all times done; and we are placed here below, I repeat, to continue the world; to transform it by improving it, not to commence or reconstruct it. That belongs to One who is stronger than we are, and who takes not counsel from the Utopists.

Here is the second great error of the Communists. How is it that they do not see that the things which they affect to abolish are nothing more than instruments; that they do not necessarily contain *evil*, any more than they produce *good;* but that they are capable of bringing forth good or evil, according to the manner in which they are organized, according to the end towards which they are directed! I love not the selfish family which establishes the well-being of its own members upon an antagonism to the well-being, or even upon an indifference to the well-being, of others; the mystery of love seems to me degraded here to the

level of the brute: but who will not love the family which, taking its part in the education of the world, regarding itself as the germ, as the first nucleus of the nation, whispers, between the mother's kiss and the father's caress, the child's first lesson of citizenship? I abhor the usurping and monopolising nation, conceiving its own grandeur and force only in the inferiority and in the poverty of others; but who would not welcome with enthusiasm and love that people which, understanding its mission in the world, should found its security upon the progress of all surrounding it, and should be ready to sustain against the oppressor the cause of right and of eternal justice, violated in the oppressed? Assuredly I do not see with favour the property of the idle man, whether capital or any other, increased by the fruit of another's labour, whilst the true producer dies; nor political privileges almost everywhere attached exclusively to landed property or to capital, as if money were synonymous with virtue or intelligence; but I believe property, as the sign and fruit of labour, to be good and useful; I see in it the representation of human individuality in the material world; I see in it not only a stimulant to labour, but a guarantee of the amelioration of labour itself; and I see something of high moral influence, not in the clod of earth, or in the tree itself; but in the sentiments which naturally grow with its cultivation or its growth in the heart of man; in the numerous associations of ideas which are attached to it; in that value which affection places on its objects, so that I may boast a little flower which, careless as I am of material good, I would not give up to anyone. Why not then endeavour to modify the organization of all these things; to make them harmonize with the great ideas of devotion, of equality, of human and social pro-

gress; instead of brutally wishing to abolish them? And do you not see that in suppressing them—if you could ever succeed in so doing—you would suppress all the modes by which human activity manifests itself—all emulation, all desire, all impulse towards progress; all that by which we have advanced; all thought of the future—in a word, *man* himself? Do you not see that in your conventional, stereotyped society—devoid of sentiment, of imagination, of aspiration—there is only room for the animal; for the satisfaction of the wants of his lower nature; for his monotonous and stationary activity, and that still you have not brought him nearer to happiness, for you have left him sorrow and death; the knowledge of which will suffice to poison his petty enjoyments when he can no longer drown it in an increasing activity, nor overcome it by the sentiment of his responsible part in the collective *progress*?

[When Mazzini first published the above articles in the *People's Journal*, they gave rise to two somewhat intemperate attacks upon him, which appeared in the same magazine—attacks which derive their sole importance from the fact that they drew from him the following reply]:—

. . . . I beg those of my readers upon whom Mr ——'s defence of Fourier may have made any impression, and who are not altogether of such easy dispositions as to found a judgment upon mere affirmations, to read attentively Fourier's work, published in 1808, entitled *Théorie des quatre mouvements*; more particularly, for I would not submit any one to too hard a trial, from page 78 to page 250. There, in the pages devoted to *Les sectes confuses, La désorganisation des sectes, La tribu à neuf groupes, La méthode d'union*

des sèxes en septiéme periode, La vestalité, L'harmonie, etc., they will find all that I have affirmed concerning the doctrine of Fourier, and much more. The more patient can add thereto the second volume of the *Traité de l'association,* and his *Théorie des accords* in the first. For all that concerns the subject of sterility in women produced by four artificial means, and above all by the *mœurs phanérogames,* the 399th page of the *Nouveau Monde Industriel,* added to the *Théorie des accords,* will be sufficient. For the way in which Fourier understood the religious question, enough may be seen in the chapter upon Freemasonry in the first work above mentioned.

I am perfectly aware of the 1620 existences, divided into *intra-mundane* and *ultra-mundane*—the first *very happy,* the others gifted with *demi-happiness*—to which Fourier treats us. I fully appreciate the *aromal* garb in which we shall reclothe ourselves after death. I have well considered the *pleasures* of the defunct; which, to sum them up, "consist in a much more extended scope being given to the twelve *radical passions* (answering to taste, smell, light, hearing, etc.) than they have in this life." I even remember that that does not prevent the extra-mundanes from being in a state of *relative unhappiness* by the loss of an infinity of pleasures which they would enjoy if the *Harmonie Sociétaire* were established. But in all this confusion of goings and comings, confined all the while to our own planet, and constituting a life varied in its action, but always *terrestrial,* I see nothing which suggests the idea—I will not say of Christian, Pagan, or any other immortality, but of immortality as a simple idea, consisting in the notion of a *progress of the soul towards God,* of which this earthly existence is a part.

I know too well that Fourier declared himself ready to accept *every* authority existing *de facto*, provided that it would lend itself to the foundation of his phalansteries. And it is precisely this that *we*—more bold, by the by, and much less pliant and indifferent than Mr —— will appear to believe—will not do. But it would have been clear to Mr —— if he had considered the general tone of my article, that I used the word *authority* in the acceptation which has been given to it by all the writers of political philosophy—belief in a moral law, the *source of human duties*, superior to the inclinations of each individual, and finding itself visibly represented in society. Now Fourier did not believe in duty. "All the philosophical caprices," said he in the work above cited, "called duties, have no connection with human nature. Duty comes from men; *attraction* from God." . . . .

I am a democrat, wishing to advance and to make others do the same, in the name of these three sacred words—Tradition, Progress, Association. I believe in the great voice of God which the ages bring to me through the universal tradition of the human race. It tells me that the Family, the Nation, and Humanity, are the three spheres through which human individuality must labour to the common end,—the moral perfecting of itself and of others, or rather of itself by others and for others; that the institution of property is destined to be the sign of the material activity of the individual; of his share in the improvement of the physical world, as the right of suffrage must indicate his share in the administration of the political world; and that it is precisely from the use, better or worse, made of such rights in these spheres of activity, that the merit or demerit of the individual before God and man

depends. It tells me that all these things, elements of human nature, have been transforming themselves, purifying themselves unceasingly, attuning themselves more and more to the Ideal of which God has endowed his creatures with the presentiment; but never perishing: and that these dreams of Communism, of the abolition or the absolute fusion of individuality in the whole, have been, through all time, only transitory incidents in the onward march of the human race; reproducing themselves at each great intellectual and moral crisis, and signalizing the urgency of a transformation; but in themselves nothing, and very happily incapable of realization; except, like the community of convents in the infancy of Christianity, upon a scale infinitely small and destitute of the power of progress.

I believe in the eternal progression of life, and, consequently, of intelligence and sentiment, in the creature of God; in the progress not only of man in the past, but also of man in the future; I think that the problem for us to solve is less that of *defining* the forms of future progress, than that of placing mankind in a condition to feel and to accomplish it, by means of a religious education, and the moral development consequent upon opening every noble path to human activity under all its forms.

I do not believe that it is given to any man, no matter whom, to improvise at any given hour a perfect plan for the organization of humanity; and still less that it is possible to render man better, more noble, more loving, more divine—which is our aim upon earth—by engaging him in any given form of material organization; or by saturating him with physical enjoyments, and proposing to him, as his *object* upon earth, this irony which is called *happiness*. And when I see in our ranks men of gener-

ous spirit exerting themselves for such experiments, I say sorrowfully to myself: Here are hearts much deceived; heads very self-satisfied and very narrow.

I believe in Association as the only means of accomplishing, upon earth, this progress to which we all aspire; not only because it multiplies the action of the productive forces—this, although important, is only so in the second degree—but because, in bringing nearer all the different manifestations of the human soul, it enlarges and renders more powerful the life of the individual, by causing him to commune with and participate in the collective life. And I know that such association can be fertile only in so far as it exists among free individuals, among free nations; having both of them the consciousness of a special mission to fulfil in the common work.

I also, as well as every other man, desire the regular satisfaction of all material wants for all those who are now dependent on the arbitrary rule of capital, and the victims of a revolting inequality—for it is necessary that man should eat and live; it is necessary that all his hours should not be absorbed by material labour, in order that he may develop the superior faculties implanted in him by God; but I listen with terror to the voices of those who say to men, *The question for you is the providing of plenty to eat and drink; your aim upon earth is enjoyment;* for I know that this language can only result in making egotists. I know that it is through the worship of the material interests that the actual government of France has succeeded in stifling through corruption the noble tendencies of the people; I know that it is by the same means that an effort is at the present time being made to divert my own country from all the noble ideas which have sanctified it through

its martyrs, and which will, some day, make of it again a great nation.

Yes, this is all the question between us; but I declare, with deep conviction, that this is immense. Fourierists, St Simonians, Communists, I know you all. By whatsoever name you clothe yourselves; whatever may be the formulæ of universal brotherhood and love that you may borrow from democracy, and although these formulæ may have a real echo in your hearts—for I do not attack your intentions, I attack only your intelligence—you are all worshippers of *utility*; you have no other *morale* than that of *interests*; your religion is that of matter. You have found the body of man impoverished and deformed by misery; and in your imprudent zeal you have said: "*Let us heal this body; when it is strong, fat, and well fed, the soul will come to it.*" And I say, you can only heal this body through the soul; *there* is the seat of the evil; the body's ills are only the exterior manifestations of the evil. That which now destroys humanity is the want of a common Faith; of a common Thought, attaching earth to heaven, the universe to God. In the absence of this religion of the mind, of which nothing has remained but empty forms and corpse-like symbols; in the consequent absence of all sentiment of duty, of all power of self-sacrifice, man, like the savage, has prostrated himself before dead matter; he has raised, upon the vacant altar, the idol INTEREST. The kings, princes, and bad governments of the day have been its high priests; it is from them that this horrible formula of the *morale* of interests has taken its rise:—*each for his own—each for himself.* They well knew that through it they would create selfishness, and that from the egotist to the slave there remains but one step, easily managed, with a little

tact; and you, coming after, without a strong religious conviction, from the height of which you would have been enabled legitimately to destroy their hideous edifice; without courage to undertake a hand-to-hand and mortal combat, you have accepted the chosen weapon of the enemy; you have said—"*They preach the interest of the class; we will preach that of the whole.*" Absurd and unrealizable dream! For either you wish to remain faithful to the worship of liberty—that is to say, of human personality—in which case you will never be able to reconcile the general interest with that of the individual, and the last result of your material progress will be the crushing of the weak by the strong;—or, wishing to avoid this danger, you will be compelled to do away with liberty—that is to say, the only guarantee of progress in this world, You must have an arbitrary hierarchy of chiefs, having the entire disposition of the common property: masters of the mind by an exclusive education; of the body by the power of deciding upon the work, the capacity, the wants of each. And these imposed or elected chiefs—it matters little which—will be, during the exercise of their power, in the position of the masters of slaves in olden times; and, influenced themselves by the theory of interest which they represent, seduced by the immense power concentrated in their hands, they will endeavour to perpetuate it; they will strive by corruption to re-assume the hereditary dictatorship of the ancient castes.

The people feel all this by instinct; and although they are horribly suffering—although you promise to transform their huts into palaces—they shake their heads and listen coldly to your string of promises, and to the description of your Morrison's pills for universal happiness. They feel that it is not from you that their

salvation will come, They feel that regarding, as you do, only one phase of human nature, you have not the mission of transforming this rotten society, founded precisely upon this very satisfaction of material interests. Preach as much as you will, you will never succeed in bringing around you more than little groups; which will disband of themselves a few years afterwards. The least of those ideas which you call "political illusions" will be more powerful with the people than your Utopias; and the five points of the Charter, incomplete and powerless as they are, because purely political and deprived of all religious sanction, will rally round them two millions of men, whilst you will not have gained more than a few hundreds, The people feel instinctively every appeal to their mind—the application, well or ill conceived, of a Principle—it is to them a guarantee of their mission upon earth—something which gives them a consciousness of self, and upraises their violated dignity. They feel through the heart, better than all the small, falsified intelligences of our day that, provided they obtain but a corner in the territory of mind, all the rest will be given to them. They will feel this more and more, and will finish by comprehending that great social transformations never have been, and never will be, other than the application of a religious principle; of a moral development; of a strong and active common faith. On the day when democracy shall elevate itself to the position of a religious party, it will carry away the victory: not before. . . . . .

. . . . . .

There have been, as I have said, in the early days of Christianity, good, pious, and sincerely enthusiastic men, who believed that they had found the ideal of the new life—in community. These were monks. They,

too, abolished the fatherland, the family, and individual property; they founded their communes, and set before themselves the duty of conquering the world. Where are the monks now, and where is the world? The monks have remained an imperceptible sect in humanity, ready to be merged in it. The world went onward, without stopping at the door of their convents. The fatherland, the family, property,—all these things were modified, transformed; nothing was abolished. The fatherland was transformed; for those belonging to other countries were no longer *barbarians:* property was transformed, for there were no longer *slaves:* the family was transformed, for children were no longer *chattels:* all who received the sacred symbol of baptism, became *persons.* Something analogous is preparing at the present time. But Communism will here play a still more ephemeral and insignificant part; for it springs not even from a religious inspiration: it arises merely from a sensual suggestion.

VII.

[The following pages were added by the author when he translated the above (1865) for the Italian edition of his works.]

The few thinkers who have quitted the ranks of the great democratic army, in order to raise their *own* poor little banner, do but delay the common progress. They create divisions in the camp; retard the normal development of our faith; generate suspicion in many who would otherwise join us, and give rise to calumnies which, although in fact unjust, are not without the outward semblance of truth. Therefore I deem it a duty

frankly to declare our belief. We have neither occult doctrines, nor links with any subversive sects; no banner save the one consecrated by the deeds of Rome and Venice, the device inscribed on which * declared the union between the religious and the political idea—between the law and its free harmonious interpretation; between the *collective* aim and the mission of the *individual.* We hold this banner boldly and freely aloft; so that none may have any right to attribute to us ideas or desires not ours, and whether the accusation be made in Pontifical encyclicas, or by hired journalists, our party will be able to answer,—*You speak falsely; and you do so knowingly.*

In 1848 the hopes of some of the working classes were excited by the appearance of a modification of Communism; an attempt to reconcile the society conceived by system-makers with the actual order of things. Such was the *Organization of labour* suggested by Louis Blanc, and the substance of it is the following:—

The government,—supreme director of the industry of the country, of production;—to aid, by means of loans, in the establishment of several social manufactories or workshops (atêliers) for the most important branches of national industry; to draw up the statutes, and, during the first year, regulate the hierarchy in the various offices thereof:

Each of the workmen in these workshops to receive an equal sum of *five francs* for eight hours' labour:

The annual profits to be distributed in the following manner: one part to be reserved to repay the money advanced by the state or individual capitalists, and to increase the inalienable capital; another part to be applied to assisting the sick and aged, and to helping other branches of industry in times of crisis; and the third part to be equally distributed among the members of the association:

* God and the People.

The members of each workshop to be free to dispose of their earnings as they choose; but a natural desire to economize, and other evident advantages, would gradually induce them to adopt a system of life in community:

Such social workshops, aided by the government and stimulated by their own interest to produce more and better than the workshops carried on upon the old system, would infallibly—according to Louis Blanc—overcome all individual industry, and compel it to adopt the new system:

The association would gradually extend to all the workshops in the same branch of industry, and a central workshop would assume the direction of all the workmen and all the work belonging to a determinate sphere of activity.

I shall not say, as many superficial accusers of Louis Blanc have said, that the system was put in practice in 1848 and failed: the *ateliers nationaux* imprudently instituted by the government in that year, were founded upon bases entirely different. But the considerations which I have urged against Communion, apply equally to the formula of Louis Blanc. It is a formula incapable of being practically carried out; and even could it be reduced to practice, it would not realize the aim intended.

In order to be efficacious, the *Organization of labour* ought to be adopted, not by a single nation only, but simultaneously by nearly all. An increased payment of labour carries with it—no matter whether the production be in the hands of capitalists or associated workmen—an increase in the price of the goods produced. The goods thus increased in price would have to compete with other goods in foreign markets, offered at a lower price. Hence would follow the necessity of restricting them to home consumption; of resisting all foreign competition, and of imposing heavy prohibitive duties upon goods introduced from abroad. Instead of extend-

ing the market—the primary aim of all economic reform—the system, if limited to a single nation, would tend to restrict it. A general political organization, a federation of nations constituted upon uniform economic bases, the abolition of all duties and customs between nation and nation, and such a division of European labour that each country should abstain from producing what another could produce cheaper, must therefore precede such organization.

"But even in the sphere of a single country, the formation of each branch of industry into a single association, is impossible. The instinct of liberty, so powerful in all individuals, would alone be sufficient to dissolve it.

"It is possible—it is a French *workman* who speaks * —to found associations *en commandite* of indefinite strength. Individuals are therein only represented by their moneys; these moneys have neither the defects nor the good qualities of men; they never quarrel. But an association of persons is a different thing. There will always be some discontented members among them, who will believe, rightly or wrongly, that their interests are sacrificed; and who will seek to withdraw from the associations, either to form others, or to work separately.

"Let us take the example of the first association; that which, according to the theory, would form the nucleus of the universal association.

"That association will naturally have a government; the directors and administrators are men, and like all men intrusted with government of any kind, liable to delay, to inertia, to a disposition to remain stationary; to all the weaknesses belonging to those who rule any

* From the *Atélier*, 1848.

undertaking. On the other side, there will be among the members of the association, active, ardent, and ambitious men, disposed to exaggerate the errors of the directing power, and convinced, rightly or wrongly, that they could manage better; these will constitute themselves leaders of opposition, and produce, sooner or later, but infallibly, discord and separation." . . . .

. . . . . .

"The need felt by all men of doing better or differently from others—that is, the need of knowledge—is so powerful, and is such an essential part of liberty, that it will always constitute an invincible obstacle to the indefinite multiplication of the *personnel* of the association, and will instead tend to promote its subdivision into fractions."

Let us suppose, however, that the association, overcoming all these tendencies of human nature, should succeed in concentrating within it all the individuals belonging to a city, a country, or an art;—would not the result be a monopoly of Producers to the injury of the Consumers? Would not the price of the articles so produced depend upon the arbitrary will of the association, certain as that association would then be of encountering no competition? Would not the price be raised in proportion to the egotism so likely to arise in a corporation the absolute masters of the market?

The government would interpose, you say. Would not the monopoly thus be transferred from the association into the hands of the five or six individuals composing the government? Is the government to determine the price of all produce, from velvet to boots and shoes; from corn to candles; from peas to pastry?

The idea of equality of wages was, with good reason, rejected as unjust; as a violation of the sacred principle

that the *value* of the labour done ought to be calculated and paid; as a negation of the good-will, intelligence, and honest activity of individuals, and of the sense of justice of the workmen. And Louis Blanc himself shortly afterwards abandoned that immoral theory; but only to substitute for it one equally immoral and impossible of application: *from each according to his capacity; to each according to his wants.*

I say nothing of how this new formula destroys all stimulus to progress, to increased activity, to invention, and to amelioration of methods. But who is to be the judge of the capacity or the wants of the individual? If the individual himself is to be judge, each will diminish the cypher representing his capacity, and augment the cypher representing his wants; to the evident injury of his fellows. If the government or the association is to be judge, is it possible to conceive a tyranny equal to this?

Either therefore the association must be voluntary, and it will gradually dissolve; or it must be compulsory, and it will constitute an immense slavery of working men: those disapproving the judgment of the majority will have no resource, nor possibility of labour: every error of the directing government will be irreparable; every tyrannical plan of the government will be irresistible. In both cases, the consumers will be either slaves of the egotism of the producers, or all progress founded upon the stimulus of competition will be withdrawn from the field of labour, from the economical world.

VIII.

Bentham, St Simonianism, Fourier, Communism, and Louis Blanc, have exhausted every phase of the doctrine

having for its basis the theory of *rights;* for its aim the *well-being* of the individual. As if to proclaim the close of the cycle of materialist systems, there arose the potent irony of Proudhon, logically to sum up the consequences of the substitution of the arbitrary conceptions of individual thought, for the conception of the progressive life of humanity. His system is a negation alike of God, of immortality, of society, of authority, of government, of education, and of a common *aim.* And to fill up the immense void, Proudhon has nothing to offer but a bank of credit. Economical life; the life of the stomach, is our problem, according to him.*

And what was the practical result of all these systems?

The 2d December: Louis Napoleon: the mission of France temporarily lost.

On the one side, the *bourgeoisie* took fright, stupidly and selfishly took fright at the idea of the consequences of those systems; men of intelligence were misled, and

*I do not feel bound to examine the system of Proudhon: his ideas—false for the most part, doubtful for the rest, and so completely refuted by himself in his later writings—do not constitute any true system. Proudhon is naught else than the Mephistopheles of Socialism; powerful to dissolve; impotent to found. Gifted with remarkable analytical power, and logical in deducing the consequences from a first proposition; he fascinates superficial readers. But the error, unnoticed, lies always in the first proposition, which he boldly presents under the guise of an axiom. Thus Proudhon places as the fundamental basis of every social function the *contract;* and he who thoughtlessly admits that pretended principle, will soon find himself involved in a whole series of undeniable consequences. But if you deduce—as is the true method—the worth of the function and of him who fulfils it, from the pre-established *aim;* and if you deduce the notion of that aim, not from an arbitrary contract, but from the nature of things, and from the moral law gradually revealed by the life of humanity and the historic tradition which is the record of that life,—the series of logical consequences is totally different. Proudhon is the incarnation of sophism. And posterity, with intellect less perverted than our own, will one day be astonished at the importance attributed by some of our contemporaries to his writings.

either wandered from the true path or retired discouraged from public life, isolating themselves in solitary protest, when it was important to struggle; while the uneducated majority of the nation regarded the Republic with suspicion, wrongly holding the Republican principle responsible for this orgie of materialism. On the other side, the working men of the large cities became accustomed to consider every question as secondary to that of material well-being; they angrily threatened every power not able or willing to carry the *socialist* theories into immediate effect; they separated their own life from the life of the nation, and began to look upon great principles with indifference, as upon empty formulæ, incapable of ameliorating their economical condition. When a man, fortified by a popular name and by every artifice of falsehoods, gold, and bayonets, said to the first: *I will protect you against the dangerous parties;* and to the others: *I will give you material well-being —you shall have in me the Emperor of democracy,*— the first hailed him as a liberator; the second folded their arms and said: *It is one more experiment added to the others.* Had they not already heard from St Simon, Fourier, and many of the Communists, that the nature of the ruling power mattered little, so long as they obtained an improvement in their condition?

But a people which denies liberty, does not deserve *well-being*, and will not obtain it. A people does not acquire, or cannot long maintain, aught that it has not conquered for itself; aught that is not the result of its own labour, exertion, and sacrifice. First Justice and Duty—the rest will follow after.

Without the religion of Duty any great social transformation is impossible. Every social transformation implies a more vast and earnest development of the

principle of Association. Now, the notion of individual rights can only spring from individual interest; and individual interest does not create association; it tends to dissolve it. The theory of *well-being*, if made the aim of a social transformation, leaves unchecked those instincts which urge the individual to enjoyment; inoculates the soul with egotism, and sanctifies the appetites. A transformation, founded upon such elements—against which our every effort in aid of progress is directed at the present day—could not endure.

The *Socialism* which the French derive from the principle of Bentham, is the worst form of that social idea, which the best spirits of democracy had already married to the political idea; and it has delayed the triumph of that idea.

But while avoiding these names and these aberrations, let not the Italians forget that *socialism* was a symptom of the tremendous crisis which hovers over all the nations of Europe more or less; and for which it is necessary to seek a remedy, if we would not see society impelled into anarchy and fratricidal war. Production is inferior to our wants at the present day. Impartially distributed, it would constitute the poverty of all. It is necessary, then, to increase it; and in order to do this, it is necessary to enlarge the circle of consumers. *All* must produce: he who does not work, has no right to live. It is necessary to increase the power of production in every individual; to remember that servile labour is immensely inferior to free labour; to emancipate the individual from all dominion or service which crushes his activity and energy; to understand that in order to *work*, it is necessary to *live*, and therefore to abolish all taxes which limit, not the *superfluities*, but the *necessaries* of life; to encourage the workman in his productive mission,

and therefore to take care that the majority of the fruits of labour belong to the producers. It is necessary to diminish or suppress the many intermediate expenses of distribution, and to bring producer and consumer together. It is necessary that working men's associations, free, spontaneous, and various; founded on self-sacrifice, virtue, love and economy, shall gradually transform the actual constitution of labour, and substitute for the present system of *wages*, the principle that the wealth of each man should be proportioned to his work; thus cancelling, not the undeniable benefits, but the excesses and disadvantages of competition.

EDUCATION, MORAL, UNIFORM, and UNIVERSALLY DIFFUSED; a complete transformation of the actual system of taxation; state economy; increase of production; progressive abolition of all but the absolutely indispensable intermediates between buyer and seller; union of capital and labour by means of working men's associations—these are the conditions of the economical problem which republican democracy is called upon to solve.

ON THE DUTIES OF MAN.

1844.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST COMPLETE EDITION OF THE DUTIES OF MAN.*

To the Italian Working Class.

To you, sons and daughters of the People, I dedicate this book. In it I have traced for you the Principles, in the name and by the aid of which, you may, if you will, fulfil your mission in Italy; a mission of Republican progress for all your countrymen, and of emancipation for yourselves.

Let those among you whom favourable circumstances or superior ability have rendered more capable of penetrating the deep meaning of these principles, explain them to the others in the same loving spirit in which I thought, while writing, of your sufferings, your aspirations, and that new life which it will be yours to diffuse over our Italian country, so soon as the unjust inequalities now so fatal to the free development of your faculties, shall be overcome.

* The four first chapters of this work were published in the *Apostolato Popolare*, a journal issued by Mazzini for the Italian working men in England (1844). It was completed in the *Pensiero e Azione* in 1858.

I have loved you from my earliest years. I was taught by the republican instincts of my mother to seek out among my fellows neither the rich man nor the great, but the true *Man;* while the simple and unconscious virtues of my father, accustomed me to value the silent unmarked spirit of self-sacrifice so frequently found in your class, far above the external and assumed superiority of semi-education.

In later years the pages of our history revealed to me the fact that the true life of Italy is the life of her People; and I saw how, during the slow progress of the ages, the shock of different races, and the superficial, ephemeral changes wrought by usurpation and conquest, had been ordained to elaborate and prepare our great, democratic, National Unity.

And I devoted myself to you, thirty years ago.

I saw that our country, our One country of free men and equals, could never be founded by an aristocracy such as ours, possessed neither of initiative power nor collective life; nor by a monarchy destitute of special mission, and devoid of all idea of unity or emancipation —a monarchy which had merely crept in amongst us in the sixteenth century, and in the track of the foreigner.

I saw that our United Italian Country could only be founded by the Italian People, and I declared this to the world.

I saw the necessity that your class should free themselves from the yoke of *hire,* and gradually elevate Labour, through the medium of Association, to be master alike of the soil and capital of the state; and, long before any French sects of socialists had distorted the question amongst us, I proclaimed it.

I saw that an Italy such as the aspirations of our hearts foretell, can never exist until the Papacy shall be

overthrown in the name of the Moral Law, acknowledged as high above all pretended intermediates between God and the People; and I avowed it.

Nor, amid the wild accusations, calumnies, and derision by which I have been assailed, have I ever betrayed your cause, nor deserted the banner of the future, even when you—led astray by the teachings of men, not *believers* but *idolaters*—forsook me for those who but trafficked in your blood, to withdraw their thoughts from you in the sequel.

The hearty and sincere grasp of the hand of some of the best among you, sons and daughters of the People, has consoled me for the faithlessness of others, and for the many bitter delusions heaped upon me by men whom I loved, and who professed to love me. I have but few years of life left to me, but the bond sealed between me and those few among yourselves, will remain inviolate to my last day, and will live beyond it.

Think, then, of me as I think of you. Let us commune together in affection for our country. The special element of her future is in you.

But our country's future, and your own, can only be realized by ridding yourselves of two great sores, which still (though I hope for no long while) contaminate our upper classes, and threaten to misdirect the advance of Italy.

These two sores are *Macchiavellism* and *Materialism*.

The first, an ignoble travesty of the doctrine of a great but unhappy man, would lead you away from the frank, brave, and loyal adoration of truth; the second, through the worship of *interest*, would inevitably drag you down to egotism and anarchy.

If you would emancipate yourselves from the arbitrary rule and tyranny of man, you must begin by rightly

adoring God. And in the world's great battle between the two principles of Good and Evil, you must openly enroll yourselves beneath the banner of the first, and ceaselessly combat the second; rejecting every dubious symbol, and every cowardly compromise or hypocrisy of all leaders who seek to strike a middle course.

Beneath the banner of the first you will ever find me by your side while life lasts.

It was because I saw these two lies—Macchiavellism and Materialism—too often clothe themselves before your eyes with the seductive fascinations of hopes which only the worship of God and Truth can realize, that I thought to warn you by this book. I love you too well either to flatter your passions or caress the golden dreams by which others seek to win your favour. My voice may sound too harsh, and I may too severely insist on proclaiming the necessity of virtue and sacrifice; but I know, and you too—untainted by false doctrines and unspoiled by wealth—will soon know also that the sole origin of every right is in a Duty fulfilled.

Farewell: accept me, now and for ever, as your brother,

JOSEPH MAZZINI.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

I INTEND to speak to you of your duties. I intend to speak to you, according to the dictates of my heart, of the holiest things we know: to speak to you of God, of Humanity, of the Fatherland and the Family.

Listen to me in love, as I shall speak to you in love.

My words are words of conviction, matured by long years of study, of experience, and of sorrow. The duties which I point out to you, I have striven, and shall strive while I live, to fulfil as far as I have the power. I may err, but my error is not of the heart. I may deceive myself, but I will not deceive you. Listen to me, then, fraternally: judge freely among yourselves whether I speak truth or error. If it seem to you that I speak error, leave me; but follow me, and act according to my teachings, if you believe me an apostle of the truth. To err is a misfortune, and deserving of commiseration; but to know the truth, and fail to regulate our actions according to its teaching, is a crime condemned alike by heaven and earth.

Wherefore do I speak to you of your *duties* before speaking to you of your *rights?* Wherefore, in a society wherein all, voluntarily or involuntarily, tend to oppress you; wherein the exercise of so many of the rights that belong to man is continually denied to you; wherein your portion is suffering, and all that which men call happiness is for other classes—do I speak to you of *self-sacrifice* rather than of *conquest?* of virtue, of moral improvement, and of education, rather than of material well-being?

This is a question which I am bound to answer clearly before I go any farther, because this is precisely the point which constitutes the difference between the school to which I belong, and many others now existing in Europe; and also because this is a question that naturally arises in the vexed mind of the suffering working-man.

We are the slaves of labour—poor and unhappy: speak to us of material improvement, of liberty, of happiness. Tell us if we are doomed to suffer for

ever; if we are never to enjoy in our turn. Preach duty to our employers; to the classes above us, who treat us like machines, and monopolise the sources of well-being, which, in justice, belong to all men. Speak to us of our rights; tell us how to gain them: speak to us of our strength: let us first obtain a recognised social and political existence; then indeed you may talk to us of our duties.

So say too many working-men, and they follow doctrines, and join associations, corresponding to such thoughts and desires; forgetful, however, of one thing, and that is, that these very doctrines to which they still appeal, have been preached during the last fifty years, without resulting in any, the slightest, material improvement in the condition of the working-man.

All that has been achieved or attempted in the cause of progress and improvement in Europe during the last fifty years, whether against absolute governments or the aristocracy of birth, has been attempted in the name of the *Rights* of man, and of *Liberty* as the means of that well-being which has been regarded as the end and aim of life. All the acts of the great French Revolution, and of those revolutions which succeeded and imitated it, were a consequence of the "*Declaration of the Rights of man.*" All the works of those philosophers whose writings prepared the way for that revolution, were founded upon a theory of Liberty, and of making known to every individual his Rights. The doctrines of all the Revolutionary Schools preached that man was born for *happiness;* that he had a right to seek happiness by every means in his power; and that no one had a right to impede him in that search; while he had a right to overthrow whatever obstacles he met in his path towards it.

And all those obstacles were overthrown; liberty was achieved. In many countries it lasted for years; in some it exists even yet.

Has the condition of the people improved? Have the millions who live by the daily labour of their hands acquired any, the smallest amount of the promised and desired well-being? No; the condition of the people is not improved. On the contrary, in most countries it has even deteriorated; and here especially, where I write, the price of the necessaries of life has continually augmented, the wages of working-men in many branches of industry have progressively diminished,* while the population has increased. In almost all countries the condition of the workman has become more uncertain, more precarious, while those crises which condemn thousands of workmen to a certain period of inertia, have become more frequent.

The annual increase of emigration from country to country, and from Europe to other parts of the world, and the ever-increasing cipher of benevolent institutions, of poor's rates, and other precautions against mendicity, suffice to prove this. They indicate that public attention is continually being attracted to the sufferings of the people; but their inefficiency visibly to diminish those sufferings, demonstrates an equally progressive augmentation of the misery of the classes in whose behalf they endeavour to provide.

And nevertheless in these last fifty years the sources of social wealth, and the mass of material means of happiness have been continually on the increase. Commerce, surmounting those frequent crises which are inevitable in the absolute absence of all organization,

* It must be borne in mind that this and the three succeeding chapters were published thirty years ago.

has achieved an increase of power and activity, and a wider sphere of operation. Communication has almost everywhere been rendered rapid and secure, and hence the price of produce has decreased in proportion to the diminished cost of transport. On the other hand, the idea that there are rights inherent to human nature is now generally admitted and accepted—hypocritically and in words at least—even by those who seek to withhold those rights. Why then has not the condition of the people improved? Why has the consumption of produce, instead of being equally distributed among all the members of European society, become concentrated in the hands of a few, of a class forming a new aristocracy? Why has the fresh impulse given to industry and commerce resulted, not in the well-being of the many, but in the luxury of the few?

The answer is clear to those who look closely into things. Men are the creatures of education, and their actions are but the consequence of the principle of education given to them. The promoters of revolutions and political transformations have hitherto founded them all upon one idea, the idea of the *rights* appertaining to the individual. Those revolutions achieved *Liberty*—individual liberty; liberty of education, liberty of belief, liberty of commerce, liberty in all things and for all men.

But of what use were rights when acquired by men who had not the means of exercising them? Of what use was mere liberty of education to men who had neither time nor means to profit by it? Of what use was mere liberty of commerce to those who possessed neither merchandise, capital, nor credit?

In all the countries wherein these principles were proclaimed, Society was composed of the small number

of individuals who were the possessors of land, of capital, and of credit; and of the vast multitude who possessed nothing but the labour of their hands, and were compelled to sell that labour to the first class, on any terms, in order to live. For such men, compelled to spend the whole day in material and monotonous exertion, and condemned to a continual struggle against hunger and want, what was liberty but an illusion, a bitter irony?

The only way to prevent this state of things would have been for the upper classes voluntarily to consent to reduce the hours of labour, while they increased its remuneration; to bestow an uniform and gratuitous education upon the multitude; to render the instruments of labour accessible to all, and create a Credit for workmen of good capacity and of good intentions.

Now, why should they have done this? Was not well-being the end and aim of life? Was not material prosperity the one thing desired by all? Why should they diminish their own enjoyments in favour of others? Let those help themselves who can. When Society has once secured to each individual the free exercise of those rights which are inherent in human nature, it has done all it is bound to do. If there be any one who, from some fatality of his own position, is unable to exercise any of these rights, let him resign himself to his fate, and not blame others.

It was natural they should speak thus, and thus in fact they spoke. And this mode of regarding the poor by the privileged classes, soon became the mode in which individuals regarded one another. Each man occupied himself with his own rights and the amelioration of his own position, without seeking to provide for others; and when those rights clashed with the rights

of others, the result was a state of war—a war, not of blood, but of gold and craft; less manly than the other, but equally fatal; a relentless war in which those who possessed means, inexorably crushed the weak and inexpert.

In this state of continual warfare, men were educated in egotism and the exclusive greed of material wellbeing. Mere liberty of belief had destroyed all community of faith. Mere liberty of education generated moral anarchy. Mankind, without any common bond, without unity of religious belief or aim, bent upon enjoyment and nought beyond, sought each and all to tread their own path, little heeding if, in pursuing it, they trampled upon the bodies of their brothers—brothers in name, but enemies in fact. This is the state of things we have reached at the present day, thanks to the theory of rights.

Rights no doubt exist; but when the rights of one individual happen to clash with those of another, how can we hope to reconcile and harmonise them, if we do not refer to something which is above all rights? And when the rights of an individual, or of many individuals, clash with the rights of the country, to what tribunal shall we appeal?

If the right to the greatest possible amount of happiness exist in *all* human beings, how are we to solve the question between the working man and the manufacturer? If the right to existence is the first inviolable right of every man, who shall demand the sacrifice of that existence for the benefit of other men?

Will you demand it in the name of the country, of society, of the multitude, your brothers?

What is their country to those who hold the theory I describe, if it be not the spot wherein their individual rights are most secure? What is society but an

assemblage of men who have agreed to bring the power of the many in support of the rights of each!

And you who for fifty years have been preaching to the individual that *society is constituted for the purpose of securing to him the exercise of his rights*, how can you ask of him to sacrifice them all in favour of that society, and submit, if need be, to ceaseless effort, to imprisonment or exile, for the sake of improving it? After having taught him by every means in your power that the end and aim of life is happiness, how can you expect him to sacrifice both happiness and life itself to free his country from foreign oppression, or produce some amelioration in the condition of a class to which he does not belong? After you have preached to him for years in the name of material *interests*, can you pretend that he shall see wealth and power within his own reach, and not stretch forth his hand to grasp them, even though to the injury of his fellow-men?

Working-men, this is no mere individual opinion, the offspring of my own mind, and unsupported by facts: it is history, the history of our own times; a history whose pages are stained with blood—the blood of the people.

Ask the men who transformed the revolution of 1830 into a mere substitution of persons, and made the corpses of your French brothers serve as stepping-stones to raise themselves to power. Their whole doctrine and teaching previously to 1830 was founded on the old theory of the rights, not on a belief in the duties of man. You call them traitors and apostates at the present day, whereas in fact they are only consistent with their own theory. They combated the government of Charles X. in all sincerity, because that government was directly inimical to the class from which they sprang, and violated, or sought to suppress, their rights.

They combated in the name of that happiness of which they considered themselves to have less than they were entitled to possess. Some of them were persecuted in their liberty of thought; others, men of powerful intellect, saw themselves neglected and shut out from offices and employments which were bestowed on men of inferior capacity to their own. Then even the wrongs of the people irritated them. Then they wrote boldly, and in good faith too, upon the rights inherent to all men.

Afterwards, when *their own* political and intellectual rights were secured; when the path to office was opened to them; when they had achieved the happiness they sought;—they forgot the people, they forgot the millions below them—their inferiors both in education and desires—who were also seeking to achieve a different description of happiness; they ceased to trouble themselves about the matter, and thought only of themselves.

Why should you call them traitors? Why not rather call their doctrine false and treacherous?

In those days there lived a man in France whom some of you have heard of, and whom you ought never to forget. He was opposed to *our* ideas then, but he believed in Duty. He believed in the duty of sacrificing our whole existence to the common good, to the search after and triumph of truth. He earnestly studied the times and men; he was neither led astray by applause, nor disheartened by delusion. When he had tried one way and found it fail, he tried again some other plan for the improvement of the many; and when the course of events had convinced him that there was only one element capable of achieving it—when the *People* had descended into the arena, and proved themselves more virtuous and more believing than all those who had

pretended to support their cause—he, *Lamennais*, the author of the *Words of a Believer*, which some of you have read, became the best apostle of the cause in which we are united.

In Lamennais, and in the men of whom I have spoken above, you may see exemplified the difference between the men of Rights and the men of Duty. To the first the conquest of their own individual rights, by withdrawing their stimulus to action, was sufficient to arrest their course; the labours of the other will cease only with his life on earth.*

And among those peoples who are completely enslaved —where the struggle has far other dangers, where every step taken towards progress is stamped with the blood of a martyr, where the struggle against the governing Injustice is necessarily secret, and deprived of the consolations of publicity and praise—what obligation, what stimulus to constancy, can be sufficient to sustain upon the path of progress those men whose theory reduces the holy social battle we are fighting into a mere struggle for their rights? I speak, be it understood, of the generality, and not of those exceptional individuals who are to be met with in all schools of doctrine.

And when that tumult of the blood and that spirit of reaction against tyranny which naturally draw the young into the struggle are passed, wherefore, after a few years of endeavour, after the inevitable delusions incidental to a similar enterprise, should they not prefer any sort of repose to a life full of inquietude, resistance, and danger, liable at any moment to end in imprisonment, on the scaffold, or in exile?

* This assertion was fully verified. Lamennais died a republican, believing in God and the People, and loving his friend Mazzini to the last.

This is but the too common story of the Italians of the present day, imbued as they are with these French doctrines; story most sad indeed, but how can we alter it, unless we alter the ruling principle which governs their conduct? How, and in the name of what, shall we convince them that danger and delusion ought only to give them new strength, and that they are bound to continue the struggle, not only for a few years, but for their whole life? Who shall bid any man to continue the struggle for his rights when that struggle costs him dearer than their renunciation?

And even in a society constituted on a juster basis than our own, who shall persuade the man believing solely in the theory of rights, that he is bound to strive for the common good, and occupy himself in the development of the social idea? Suppose he should rebel; suppose he should feel himself strong enough to say to you, *I break the social bond; my tendencies and my faculties invite me elsewhere; I have a sacred, an inviolable right to develope those tendencies and faculties, and I choose to be at war with the rest*; what answer can you make him within the limits of the Doctrine of Rights? What right have you, merely as a majority, to compel his obedience to laws which do not accord with his individual desires and aspirations? What right have you to punish him should he violate those laws?

The Rights of each individual are equal: the mere fact of living together in society does not create a single one. Society has greater power, not greater rights, than the individual. How, then, will you prove to the individual that he is bound to confound his will in the will of his brothers, whether of country or of humanity?

By means of the prison or the executioner?

Every society that has existed hitherto has employed these means.

But this is a state of war, and we need peace: this is tyrannical repression, and we need Education.

EDUCATION, I have said, and my whole doctrine is included and summed up in this grand word. The vital question in agitation at the present day is a question of Education. We do not seek to establish a new order of things through violence. Any order of things established through violence, even though in itself superior to the old, is still a tyranny. What we have to do is to propose, for the approval of the nation, an order of things which we believe to be superior to that now existing, and to *educate* men by every possible means to develope it and act in accordance with it.

The theory of Rights may suffice to arouse men to overthrow the obstacles placed in their path by tyranny, but it is impotent where the object in view is to create a noble and powerful harmony between the various elements of which the nation is composed. With the theory of happiness as the primary aim of existence, we shall only produce egotists who will carry the old passions and desires into the new order of things, and introduce corruption into it a few months after. We have therefore to seek a Principle of Education superior to any such theory, and capable of guiding mankind onwards towards their own improvement, of teaching them constancy and self-sacrifice, and of uniting them with their fellow-men, without making them dependent either on the *idea* of a single man or the *force* of the majority.

This principle is DUTY. We must convince men that they are all sons of one sole God, and bound to fulfil and execute one sole law here on earth: that each

of them is bound to live, not for himself, but for others; that the aim of existence is, not to be more or less happy, but to make themselves and others more virtuous; that to struggle against injustice and error (wherever they exist), in the name and for the benefit of their brothers, is not only a *right* but a Duty; a duty which may not be neglected without sin, the duty of their whole life.

Working-men, brothers! understand me well. When I say that the consciousness of your rights will never suffice to produce an important and durable progress, I do not ask you to renounce those rights. I merely say that such rights can only exist as a consequence of duties fulfilled, and that we must begin with fulfilling the last in order to achieve the first. And when I say that in proposing happiness, wellbeing, or material interests, as the aim of existence, we run the risk of producing egotists, I do not say that you ought never to occupy yourselves with these; but I do say that the exclusive endeavour after material interests, sought for, not as a *means*, but as an *end*, always leads to disastrous and deplorable results.

When the ancient Romans, under the emperors, contented themselves with *bread and amusements*, they had become as abject a race as can be conceived; and after submitting to the stupid and ferocious rule of their emperors, they vilely succumbed to and were enslaved by their barbarian invaders. In France and elsewhere it has ever been the plan of the opponents of social progress to spread corruption by endeavouring to lead men's minds away from thoughts of change and improvement, through furthering the development of mere material activity. And shall we help our adversaries with our own hands?

Material ameliorations are essential, and we will strive to obtain them, not because the one thing necessary to man is that he should be well housed and nourished; but because you can neither acquire a true consciousness of your own dignity, nor achieve your own moral development, so long as you are engaged, as at the present day, in a continual struggle with poverty and want.

You labour for ten or twelve hours of the day: how can you find *time* to educate yourselves? The greater number of you scarcely earn enough to maintain yourselves and your families: how can you find *means* to educate yourselves? The frequent interruption and uncertain duration of your work causes you to alternate excessive labour with periods of idleness: how are you to acquire habits of order, regularity, and assiduity? The scantiness of your earnings prevents all hope of saving a sum sufficient to be one day useful to your children, or to provide for the support of your own old age: how can you acquire habits of economy? Many among you are compelled by poverty to withdraw your children—I will not say from the instruction, for what educational instruction can the poor wife of a workingman bestow upon her children?—but from the mother's watchfulness and love, in order that they may gain a few pence in the unwholesome and injurious labour of manufactories. How can children so circumstanced be developed under the softening influence of family affection?

You have no rights of citizenship, nor participation, either of election or vote, in those laws which are to direct your actions and govern your life. How can you feel the sentiment of citizenship, zeal for the welfare of the state, or sincere affection for its laws?

Your poverty frequently involves the impossibility of your obtaining justice like the other classes: how are you to learn to love and respect justice? Society treats you without a shadow of sympathy: how are you to learn sympathy with society?

It is therefore needful that your material condition should be improved, in order that you may morally progress. It is necessary that you should labour less, so that you may consecrate some hours every day to your soul's improvement. It is needful that you should receive such remuneration for your labour as may enable you to accumulate a sufficient saving to tranquillise your minds as to your future; and above all, it is necessary to purify your souls from all reaction, from all sentiment of vengeance, from every thought of injustice, even towards those who have been unjust to you. You are bound, therefore, to strive for all these ameliorations in your condition, and you will obtain them; but you must seek them as a means, not as an end; seek them from a sense of duty, and not merely as a right; seek them in order that you may become more virtuous, not in order that you may be materially happy.

If not so, where would be the difference between you and those by whom you have been oppressed? They oppressed you precisely because they only sought happiness, enjoyment, and power.

Improve yourselves! Let this be the aim of your life. It is only by improving yourselves, by becoming more virtuous, that you can render your condition lastingly less unhappy. Petty tyrants would arise among yourselves by thousands, so long as you should merely strive to advance in the name of material interests or a special social organization. A change of social organiza-

tion is of little moment while you yourselves remain with your present passions and egotism. Social organizations are like certain plants which yield either poison or medicine according to the mode in which they are administered. Good men can work good even out of an evil organization, and bad men can work evil out of good organizations.

No doubt it is also necessary to improve the classes who now oppress you, but you will never succeed in doing this, unless you begin by improving yourselves.

When, therefore, you hear those who preach the necessity of a social transformation declare that they can accomplish it solely by invoking your rights, be grateful to them for their good intentions, but be distrustful of their success. The sufferings of the poor are partially known to the wealthier classes; *known*, but not *felt*. In the general indifference resulting from the absence of a common faith; in the egotism which is the inevitable consequence of so many years spent in preaching material happiness; those who do not suffer themselves have, little by little, become accustomed to regard the sufferings of others as a sorrowful necessity of social organization, or to leave the remedy to the generations to come. The difficulty lies, not so much in convincing them, as in rousing them from their inertia, and inducing them, when once convinced, to *act*; to associate together, and to fraternise with you in order to create such a social organization as shall put an end—as far as human possibilities allow—to your sufferings and their own fears.

Now, to do this is a work of Faith; of faith in that mission which God has given to his human creature here on earth; in the responsibility which weighs upon all those who fail to fulfil that mission; and in the

Duty imposed upon all, of continual endeavour and sacrifice in the cause of truth.

Any conceivable doctrine of Right and material happiness can only lead you to attempts which, so long as you remain isolated, and rely solely on your own strength, can never succeed; and which can but result in that worst of crimes, a civil war between class and class.

Working-men! Brothers! When Christ came, and changed the face of the world, he spoke not of rights to the rich, who needed not to achieve them; nor to the poor, who would doubtless have abused them, in imitation of the rich; he spoke not of utility nor of interest to a people whom interest and utility had corrupted; he spoke of Duty, he spoke of Love, of Sacrifice, and of Faith; and he said that *they should be first among all who had contributed most by their labour to the good of all.*

And the words of Christ, breathed in the ear of a society in which all true life was extinct, recalled it to existence, conquered the millions, conquered the world, and caused the education of the human race to ascend one degree on the scale of progress.

Working-men! We live in an epoch similar to that of Christ. We live in the midst of a society as corrupt as that of the Roman Empire, feeling in our inmost soul the need of re-animating and transforming it, and of uniting all its various members in one sole faith, beneath one sole law, in one sole Aim—the free and progressive development of all the faculties of which God has given the germ to his creatures. We seek the kingdom of God *on earth as it is in heaven*, or rather, that earth may become a preparation for heaven, and society an endeavour after the progressive realization of the Divine Idea.

But Christ's every act was the visible representation of the Faith he preached; and around him stood Apostles who incarnated in their actions the faith they had accepted. Be you such, and you will conquer. Preach duty to the classes above you, and fulfil, as far as in you lies, your own. Preach virtue, sacrifice, and love; and be yourselves virtuous, loving, and ready for self-sacrifice. Speak your thoughts boldly, and make known your wants courageously; but without anger, without reaction, and without threats. The strongest menace, if indeed there be those for whom threats are necessary, will be the firmness, not the irritation of your speech.

While you propagate amongst your brothers the idea of a better future, which shall secure to them education, work, its fitting remuneration, and the conscience and mission of Men, strive also to instruct and improve yourselves, and to educate yourselves to the full knowledge and practice of your duties.

At present this is a labour rendered impossible to the masses in many parts of England. No plan of popular education can be realized alone: a change both in the political and material condition of the people is also needed; and they who imagine that an educational transformation may be accomplished alone, deceive themselves.

A few among you, once imbued with the true principles on which the moral, social, and political education of a People depend, will suffice to spread them among the millions, as a guide on their way, to protect them from the sophisms and false doctrines by which it will be sought to lead them astray.

CHAPTER II.

GOD.

THE source of your Duties is in God. The definition of your duties is found in his Law. The progressive discovery and application of this law is the mission of Humanity.

God exists. I am not bound to prove this to you, nor shall I endeavour to do so. To me the attempt would seem blasphemous, as the denial appears madness.

God exists, because we exist. God lives in our conscience, in the conscience of Humanity. Our conscience invokes him in our most solemn moments of grief or joy. Humanity has been able to transform, to disfigure, never to suppress his holy name. The Universe bears witness to him in the order, harmony, and intelligence of its movements and its laws.

There are, I hope, no atheists among you. Were there any, they would deserve pity rather than malediction. He who can deny God either in the face of a starlight night; when standing beside the tomb of those dearest to him; or in the presence of martyrdom, is either greatly unhappy, or greatly guilty. The first atheist was surely one who had concealed some crime from his fellow-men, and who sought by denying God to free himself from the sole witness from whom concealment was impossible, and thus stifle the remorse by which he was tormented. Or perhaps the first atheist was a tyrant, who, having destroyed one half of the soul of his brethren by depriving them of liberty, endeavoured to substitute the worship of brute force, for faith in duty and eternal right.

After these, from age to age, there came men, here

and there, who taught atheism from philosophical aberration; but they were few and ashamed. After these, in days not far removed from our own, came the many who, from reaction against a false and absurd idea of God created by some tyranny or caste, denied God himself: but it was only for an instant, and even during that instant—so great was the need they felt of Divinity—that even they worshipped a goddess of reason and a goddess of nature.

At the present day there are many men who abhor all religion because they see the corruption of the actual creeds, and have no conception of the purity of the Religion of the Future; but none of these venture to declare themselves atheists. There do indeed exist priests who prostitute the name of God to the calculations of a venal self-interest, and tyrants who falsify His name by invoking it in support of their tyranny; but because the light of the sun is often obscured by impure vapours, shall we deny the sun himself, and the vivifying influence of his rays throughout the universe? Because the liberty of the wicked sometimes produces anarchy, shall we curse the name of liberty itself?

The undying light of faith in God pierces through all the imposture and corruption wherewith men have darkened His name. Imposture and corruption pass away; tyrannies pass away; but God remains, as the people, image of God on earth, remains. Even as the people passes through slavery, poverty, and suffering, to achieve self-consciousness, power, and emancipation, step by step; so does the holy name of God arise above the ruins of corrupt creeds, to shine forth surrounded by a purer, more intense, and more rational form of worship.

I do not therefore speak to you of God in order to

demonstrate to you His existence, or to tell you that you are bound to worship Him; you do worship Him whensoever you deeply *feel* your own *life*, and that of the fellow-beings by whom you are surrounded; but in order to tell you how to worship Him, and to admonish you of an error that predominates in the classes by whom you are governed, and through their example influences too many among yourselves, an error as grave and fatal as atheism itself.

This error is the separation, more or less apparent, of God from His work, from that earth upon which you are called to fulfil one period of your existence.

"On the one side there are men who tell you, "*It is very true that God exists, but the only thing you can do is to confess His existence, and adore Him. None can comprehend or declare the relation between God and your conscience. Reflect upon all this as much as you please, but neither propound your own belief to your fellow-men, nor seek to apply it to the affairs of this earth.*

"*Politics are one thing, Religion another. Do not confound them together. Leave all heavenly things to the spiritual Authorities, whatsoever they may be, reserving to yourselves the right of refusing them your belief if they appear to you to betray their mission. Let each man believe in his own way; the only things about which you are bound to concern yourselves in common, are the things of this world. Materialists, or spiritualists, whichsoever you be, do you believe in the liberty and equality of mankind? do you desire the wellbeing of the majority? do you believe in universal suffrage? Unite together to obtain these things; in order to obtain these, you will have no occasion to come to a common understanding about heavenly things.*"

On the other side you have men who say to you, "*God exists: but He is too great, too superior to all created things, for you to hope to approach Him through any human work. The earth is of clay. Life is but a day. Withdraw yourselves from the first as far as possible, and do not value the other above its worth. What are all earthly interests in comparison with the immortal life of your soul? Think of* this! *Fix your eyes on heaven. What matters it how you live here below? You are doomed to die, and God will judge you, according to the thoughts you have given, not to earth, but to Him. Are you unhappy? Bless the God who has sent you sorrows. Terrestrial existence is but a period of trial, the earth but a land of exile. Despise it, and raise yourselves above it. In the midst of sorrows, poverty, or slavery, you can still turn to God, and sanctify yourselves in adoration of Him, in prayer, and in faith in a future that will largely recompense you for having despised every worldly thing.*"

Of those who thus speak to you, the first do not *love* God, the second do not *know* Him.

Say to the first that man is One. You cannot divide him in half, and so contrive that he shall agree with you in those principles which regulate the origin of *society*, while he differs with you as regards his *own* origin, destiny, and law of life here below. The world is governed by Religions. When the Indians really believed that some of them were born from the head, others from the arms, and others from the feet of Bramah, their Divinity, they organized their society by distributing mankind into *castes*; assigning to one caste an inheritance of intellectual labour, to another of military, and to others of servile duties; and thus con-

demned themselves to an immobility that still endures, and that will endure so long as belief in that religious principle shall last.

When the Christians declared to the world that *all* men were the sons of God, and brethren in His name, all the doctrines of the legislators and philosophers of antiquity, tending to establish the existence of two races of men, availed not to prevent the abolition of slavery, and a consequent radical re-organization of society.

For every advance in religious belief we can point to a corresponding social advance in the history of Humanity, while the only result you can show, as a consequence of your doctrine of indifference in matters of religion, is anarchy. You have been able to destroy, never to build up. Disprove this if you can.

By dint of exaggerating one of the principles of Protestantism—a principle which Protestantism itself now feels the necessity of abandoning—by dint of deducing all your ideas from the sole principle of the independence of the individual, you have achieved—what?

In commerce you have achieved anarchy—that is to say, the oppression of the weak. In politics you have achieved liberty—that is to say, the derision of the weak, who have neither time, nor means, nor instruction sufficient to enable them to exercise their rights. In morals you have achieved egotism—that is to say, the isolation and ruin of the weak, who cannot raise themselves alone.

But what we seek is *Association.*

How shall we realize this securely, unless among brothers, believing in the same ruling principle, united in the same faith, and bearing witness by the same name.

What we seek is *Education.*

How shall we give or receive it, unless in virtue of a principle that sums up and expresses our common belief as to the origin, the aim, and the law of life of mankind upon earth ?

We seek a *common* Education.

How shall we give or receive it without belief in a *common* faith and a *common duty ?*

And whence can we deduce a common duty, if not from the idea we form of God and of our relation to Him ?

Doubtless universal suffrage is an excellent thing. It is the only legal means by which a people may govern itself without risk of continual violent crises. Universal suffrage in a country governed by a common faith is the expression of the national will ; but in a country deprived of a common belief, what can it be but the mere expression of the interests of those numerically the stronger, to the oppression of all the rest ?

All the political reforms achieved in countries either irreligious or indifferent to religion, have lasted as long as interest allowed—no longer. On this point the experience of political movements in Europe during the last fifty years has taught us lessons enough.

To those who speak to you of heaven, and seek to separate it from earth, you will say that heaven and earth are One, even as the *way* and the *goal* are one. Tell us not that the earth is of clay. The earth is of God. God created it as the medium through which we may ascend to Him. The earth is not a mere sojourn of temptation or of expiation ; it is the appointed dwelling-place wherein we are bound to work out our own improvement and development, and advance towards a higher stage of existence. God created us, not to contemplate, but to act. He created us in His own image,

and He is *Thought* and *Action*, or rather, in Him there is no Thought which is not simultaneous Action.

You tell us to despise all worldly things, to trample under foot our terrestrial life in order to concern ourselves solely with the celestial; but what is our terrestrial life save a prelude to the celestial, a step towards it? See you not that, while sanctifying the last step of the ladder by which we must all ascend, by thus declaring the first step accursed, you arrest us on the way?

The life of a soul is sacred in every stage of its existence; as sacred in the earthly stage as in those which are to follow: each stage must be made a preparation for the next, every temporary advance must aid the gradual ascending progress of that immortal life breathed into us all by God himself, as well as the progress of the great Entity—Humanity, which is developed through the labour of each and every individual.

God has placed you here upon this earth. He has surrounded you with myriads of fellow-beings, whose minds receive aliment from your own, whose development progresses simultaneously with your own, whose life is fecundated by your own. In order to preserve you from the dangers of isolation, He has given you desires which you are incapable of satisfying alone, and those dominating social instincts, which distinguish you from the brute creation, in which they are dormant. He has spread around you a material world, magnificent in beauty and pregnant with life; a life—be it ever remembered—which, though it reveal itself by divine impulse, yet everywhere awaits your labour, and modifies its manifestations through you, increasing in power and vigour in proportion to your increased activity.

God has given you certain sympathies which are inextinguishable. Such are pity for those that mourn,

and joy for those that rejoice; anger against those who oppress their fellow-creatures; a ceaseless yearning after truth; admiration for the genius that discovers a new portion or form of truth; enthusiasm for those who reduce it into beneficial action on mankind, and religious veneration for those who, failing to achieve its triumph, yet bear witness to it with their blood, and die in martyrdom: and you deny and reject all the indications of your mission which God has thus clustered around you, when you cry anathema on the work of His hand, and call upon us to concentrate all our faculties on a work of mere inward purification, necessarily imperfect, nay impossible, if sought alone.

Does not God punish those who strive to do this? Is not the slave degraded? Is not one half of the soul of the poor day-labourer, doomed to consume the light divine in a series of physical acts unrelieved by a gleam of education, buried beneath its animal appetites, in those blind instincts which you name material? Do you find more religious faith in the poor Russian serf than in the Pole fighting the battle of country and liberty? Do you find more fervent love of God in the degraded subject of a pope or despotic king, than in the Lombard republicans of the twelfth, or Florentine republicans of the fourteenth century?

"Wheresoever is the spirit of God, there is liberty," has been declared by one of the most powerful Apostles the world has known, and the religion he preached decreed the abolition of slavery. Who that crouches at the foot of the creature, can rightly know and worship the Creator?

Yours is not a Religion, it is the sect of men who have forgotten their origin, forgotten the battles which their fathers fought against a corrupt society, and the

victories they gained in transforming the world which you despise, O men of contemplation!

The first real, earnest religious Faith that shall arise upon the ruins of the old worn-out creeds, will transform the whole of our actual social organization, because every strong and earnest faith tends to apply itself to every branch of human activity; because in every epoch of its existence the *earth* has ever tended to conform itself to the Heaven in which it then believed; and because the whole history of Humanity is but the repetition—in form and degree varying according to the diversity of the times—of the words of the Dominical Christian Prayer: *Thy Kingdom come on Earth as it is in Heaven.*

Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven. Let these words—better understood and better applied than in the past—be the utterance of your faith, your prayer, O my brothers! Repeat them, and strive to fulfil them. No matter if others seek to persuade you to passive resignation and indifference to earthly things, if they preach submission to every temporal authority, however unjust, by quoting to you—without comprehending them—the words "*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.*"

Nothing is of Cæsar unless it be such in conformity with the law of God. Cæsar—that is to say, the Temporal power or Civil government—is but the administrator and executive, as far as lies in its power, of the design of the Almighty. Whensoever it is false to its mission and trust, it is, I do not say your *right*, but your *duty* to change it.

For what purpose are you placed here, if it be not to work out the providential design in your own sphere, and according to your means? To what purpose do

you profess to *believe* in that Unity of the human race which is the necessary consequence of the Unity of God, if you do not strive to verify it, by destroying the arbitrary divisions and enmities that still separate the different tribes of Humanity?

What avails it to *believe* in human liberty—the basis of human responsibility—if you do not labour to overthrow all the obstacles that impede the first and destroy the second? Why do we talk of fraternity, while we allow any of our brethren to be trampled on, degraded, or despised?

The earth is our Workshop. We may not curse it, we are bound to sanctify it.

The material forces that surround us are our instruments of labour; we may not reject them, we are bound to direct them for good.

But this we cannot do alone, without God.

I have spoken to you of duties: I have told you that the consciousness of your rights will never suffice you as a permanent guide on the path towards perfection; it will not even suffice to procure for you the continuous progressive improvement in your condition which you seek and desire.

Now, apart from God, whence can you derive duty? Without God, whatsoever system you attempt to lean upon, you will find it has no other foundation or basis than Force—blind, tyrannical, brute force.

There is no escape from this.

Either the development of human things depends upon a Providential Law which we are all bound to seek to discover and apply, or it is left to chance, to passing circumstance, and to that man who contrives best to turn these to account.

We must either obey God or serve man; whether one man or many, matters little.

If there be not a governing Mind, supreme over every human mind, what shall preserve us from the dominion of our fellow-men, whenever they are stronger than ourselves?

If there be not one holy inviolable Law, uncreated by man, what rule have we by which to judge whether a given act be just or unjust?

In the name of whom, or of what, shall we protest against inequality and oppression?

Without God there is no other rule than that of *Fact*, the accomplished fact, before which the materialist ever bows his head, whether its name be Bonaparte or Revolution.

How can we expect men to sacrifice themselves, or to suffer martyrdom, in the name of our individual opinions?

Can we transform theory into practice, abstract principle into action, on the strength of interests alone?

Be not deceived. So long as we endeavour to teach sacrifice as individuals, or on whatever theory our mere individual intellect may suggest, we may find adherents in words, never in act. That cry only, which has resounded in all great and noble revolutions, the "*God wills it, God wills it,*" of the Crusades, will have power to rouse the inert to action, to give courage to the timid, the enthusiasm of sacrifice to the calculating, and faith to those who distrust and reject all mere human ideas.

Prove to mankind that the work of progressive development to which you would call them, is a part of the design of God, and none will rebel. Prove to them that the earthly duties to be fulfilled here below, are an essential portion of their immortal life, and all the calculations of the present will vanish before the grandeur of the future.

Without God you may compel, but not persuade; you may become tyrants in your turn, you cannot be Educators or Apostles.

CHAPTER III.

THE LAW.

You live. Therefore you have a law of life. There is no life without its law. Whatever thing exists, exists in a certain method, according to certain conditions, and is governed by a certain law.

The mineral world is governed by a law of aggregation; the vegetable world by a law of development; the stars are ruled by a law of motion.

Your life is governed by a law higher and nobler than these, even as you are superior to all other created earthly things. To develope yourselves, and act and live according to your law, is your first, or rather your sole duty.

God gave you life: God therefore gave you the law. God is the sole lawgiver to the human race. His law is the sole law you are bound to obey. Human laws are only good and valid in so far as they conform to, explain, and apply the law of God. They are evil whensoever they contrast with or oppose it, and it is then not only your right, but your duty to disobey and abolish them.

He who shall best explain the law of God, and best apply it to human things, is your legitimate ruler. Love him and follow him. But you have not, and cannot have, any Master save God Himself. To accept any other is to be unfaithful and rebellious to Him.

The foundation of all morality, therefore, the regula-

tion of all your acts and duties, and the measure of your responsibility, is to be found in the knowledge of your law of life, of the law of God. It is also your defence against the unjust laws which the tyranny of one man, or many men, may seek to impose upon you.

Unless you know this law, you may not pretend to the name or the rights of men. All rights have their origin in a law, and while you are unable to invoke this law, you may be tyrants or slaves—tyrants if you are strong, the slaves of the stronger if you are weak—naught else.

In order to be *Men*, you must know the law which distinguishes *human* nature from that of the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, and to it you must conform your actions. Now, how are you to know this law?

This is the question which humanity has ever addressed to those who have pronounced the word Duty, and the answers are various even yet.

Some have replied by pointing to a code, or book, saying: *The whole law of morals is comprised in this book.* Others have said: *Let every man interrogate his own conscience: he will find the definition of good and evil there.* Others, again, rejecting the judgment of the individual, invoke the universal judgment, and declare: *Whenever humanity is agreed in a belief, that belief is the truth.*

Each and all of these are in error. And facts, unanswerable in the history of the human race, have proved the impotence of all these answers.

Those who declare that the *whole* moral law is contained in a book, or uttered by one man, forget that there is no single code of morals which Humanity has not abandoned, after an acceptance and belief of some

centuries, in order to seek after and diffuse another more advanced than it; nor is there any special reason for supposing that Humanity will alter its course now.

It will be sufficient to remind those who declare the conscience of the individual to be an adequate criterion of the just and true, that no Religion, however holy, has existed without heretics, dissenters who dissented from conviction, and were ready to endure martyrdom for their conscience' sake. The Protestant world is at the present day divided and subdivided into a thousand sects, all founded on the rights of individual conscience, all eager to make war on one another, and perpetuating that anarchy of beliefs, which is the sole true cause of the social and political disturbances that torment the peoples of Europe. And on the other hand, to those who reject the testimony of individual conscience, and invoke the consent of Humanity in their faith, suffice it to say, that all the great ideas that have contributed to the progress of Humanity hitherto, were, at their commencement, in *opposition* to the belief then accepted by Humanity, and were preached by *individuals* whom Humanity derided, persecuted, and crucified.

Each of these rules, then, is insufficient in order to obtain a knowledge of the law of God, of truth.

Yet, nevertheless, individual conscience is sacred, and the common consent of Humanity is sacred; and he who refuses to interrogate either of these, deprives himself of one essential means of reaching truth. The common error hitherto, has been the endeavour to reach truth by the help of one of these tests alone; an error fatal and decisive in its consequences, because it is impossible to elevate individual conscience as the sole judge of truth, without falling into anarchy; and it is impossible to appeal, at a given moment, to the general

consent of Humanity, without crushing human liberty, and producing tyranny. Thus,—and I quote these examples in order to show how, far more than is generally supposed, the entire social edifice is founded upon these primary bases,—thus some men have fallen into the error of organizing society solely with respect to the rights of the individual, wholly forgetful of the educational mission of society; while others have based their organization solely on the rights of society, sacrificing the free action and liberty of the individual.*

France after her great revolution, and (still more markedly) England, have taught us that the first system results in inequality and the oppression of the many. Communism, were it ever elevated into a *Fact*, would teach us how the second condemns society to petrifaction, by destroying alike all motive and all opportunity of progress.

Thus some, in consideration of the pretended rights of the individual, have organized, or rather disorganized society, by founding it upon the sole basis of unlimited freedom of competition; while others, merely regarding social unity, would give the government the monopoly of all the productive forces of the state.

The first of these conceptions has resulted in all the evils of anarchy. The second would result in immobility and all the evils of tyranny.

God has given you both the consent of your fellow-men and your own conscience, even as two wings wherewith to elevate yourselves towards Him. Why persist in cutting off one of them? Wherefore either isolate

* *I speak, of course, of those countries governed by a constitutional monarchy, and in which a certain organization of society is attempted. In countries despotically governed there is no society; individual and social rights being equally sacrificed.*

yourselves from, or absorb yourselves in, the world? Why seek to stifle either the voice of the individual, or of the human race? Both are sacred. God speaks through each. *Whensoever they agree*, whensoever the cry of your own conscience is ratified by the consent of Humanity, God is there. Then are you certain of having found the truth, for the one is the verification of the other.

If your duties were merely negative, if they merely consisted in not doing evil, in not injuring your brethermen, perhaps, even in the stage of development which the least educated among you have reached, the voice of conscience might suffice you for a guide. You are born with a tendency towards good, and every time you act directly contrary to the moral law, every time you commit what mankind has agreed to name sin, there is a something within you that condemns you, a cry of reproval which you may conceal from others, but cannot from yourselves.

But your most important duties are *positive*. It is not enough *not* to do: you are bound to *act*. It is not enough to limit yourselves to not acting against the Law: you are bound to act according to the Law. It is not enough not to do harm to your brethren: you are bound to do good to them. Hitherto morality has too often been presented to mankind in a form rather negative than affirmative. The interpreters of the law have said to us: "Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal." Few or none have taught us the active duties of man, how he may be useful to his fellow-creatures, and further the design of God in the creation. Yet this is the primary aim of morals, and no individual can reach that aim by the light of conscience alone.

Individual conscience speaks in proportion to the

education, tendencies, habits, and passions of the individual. The conscience of the savage Iroquois speaks a different language to that of the enlightened European of the nineteenth century. The conscience of the freeman suggests duties which the conscience of the slave does not even imagine. Ask the poor Lombard or Neapolitan peasant,* whose only teacher of morality has been a bad priest, or to whom—even if he know how to read—the Austrian catechism is the sole book allowed; he will perhaps tell you that his sole duties are to work hard for any remuneration he can obtain, in order to maintain his family; to submit without examination to the laws of the State, whatsoever they may be, and to do no wrong to others. Should you say to him: *But you injure your brother men by accepting a remuneration below the value of your labour, and you sin against God and your own soul, by obeying laws which are unjust,* he will answer you with the fixed gaze of one who understands you not.

Interrogate the Italian workman, to whom more fortunate circumstances and contact with men of greater intellectual enlightenment have made known a portion of the truth; he will tell you that his country is enslaved, that his brothers are *unjustly* condemned to pass their days in moral and material want, and that he feels it his duty to protest as far as he can against that injustice.

Whence this great difference between the dictates of the conscience of two individuals at the same epoch in the same country? Wherefore, among ten individuals belonging substantially to the same religious belief,—that which decrees the development and progress of the human race,—do we find ten different opinions as to the

* Written thirty years ago.

mode of reducing that belief to action—that is to say, as to their *duties?* Evidently the voice of individual conscience does not suffice at all times, without any other guide, to make known to us the law. Conscience alone may teach us that a law exists; it cannot teach us the duties thence derived. Thus it is that martyrdom has never been extinguished amongst mankind, however great the predominance of egotism; but how many martyrs have sacrificed their existence for imaginary duties, or for errors patent to all of us at the present day!

Conscience therefore has need of a guide, of a torch to illumine the darkness by which it is surrounded, of a rule by which to direct and verify its instincts.

This rule is the *Intellect of Humanity.*

God has given intellect to each of you in order that you may educate it to know His Law. At the present day you are deprived by poverty, and the inveterate errors of ages, of the possibility of full education, and therefore the obstacles to education are the first you have to overcome. But even were all these obstacles removed, the intellect of the individual man would still be insufficient to acquire a knowledge of the law of God, unless aided and supported by the intellect of Humanity. Your life is brief, your individual faculties weak and uncertain; they need alike verification and support. Now God has placed beside you a Being whose life is continuous, whose faculties are the results and sum of all the individual faculties that have existed for perhaps four hundred ages; a being who, in the midst of the errors and crimes of individuals, yet ever advances in wisdom and morality; a being in whose development and progress God has inscribed, and from epoch to epoch does still inscribe, a line of His law.

This being is Humanity.

A thinker of the past century has described Humanity as *A man that lives and learns for ever.* Individuals die, but the amount of truth they have thought, and the sum of good they have done, dies not with them. The men who pass over their graves reap the benefit thereof, and Humanity garners it up.

Each of us is born to-day in an atmosphere of ideas and beliefs which has been elaborated by all anterior Humanity, and each of us brings with him (even if unconsciously) an element, more or less important, of the life of Humanity to come. The education of Humanity is built up like those Eastern pyramids to which every passing traveller added a stone. We pass along, the voyagers of a day, destined to complete our individual education elsewhere, but the education of Humanity, which is seen by glimpses in each of us, is slowly, progressively, and continuously evolved through Humanity.

Humanity is the Word, living in God. The Spirit of God fecundates it, and manifests itself through it, in greater purity and activity from epoch to epoch, now through the instrumentality of an individual, now through that of a people. From labour to labour, from belief to belief, Humanity gradually acquires a clearer perception of its own life, of its own mission, of its God, and of His law.

Humanity is the *successive* incarnation of God.

The law of God is one, as God Himself is one; but we only discover it article by article, line by line, according to the accumulated experience of the generations that have preceded us, and according to the extension and increased intensity of *association* among races, peoples, and individuals. No man, no people, and no age may pretend to have discovered the whole of the

Law. The Moral Law, Humanity's law of life, can only be discovered, in its entirety, by all Humanity united in holy association, when all the forces, and all the faculties that constitute our human nature, shall be developed and in action. But meanwhile, that portion of Humanity most advanced in education does, in its progress and development, reveal to us a portion of the Law we seek to know. Its history teaches us the design of God; its wants teach us our duties; because our first duty is to endeavour to aid the ascent of Humanity upon that stage of education and improvement towards which it has been prepared and matured by time and the Divinity.

In order, therefore, to know the Law of God, you must interrogate not only *your own* conscience, but also the conscience and consent of Humanity. In order to know your own duties, you must interrogate the present wants of Humanity. Morality is progressive, as is your education and that of the human race. The morality of Christianity was different from that of Paganism, the morality of our own age differs from the morality of eighteen hundred years ago.

Be assured that without education you cannot know your duties, and that whenever society prevents you from obtaining education, the responsibility of your errors rests upon society, not upon you; your responsibility begins on the day in which a path to instruction is opened to you, and you neglect to pursue it; on the day in which the means are offered to you by which to transform the society which has too long condemned you to ignorance, and you neglect to seize them. You are not guilty because you are ignorant, but you are guilty when you resign yourselves to ignorance. You are guilty whenever—although your conscience whispers that God

did not give you faculties without imposing upon you the duty of developing them—you allow the faculty of reflection to lie dormant within you; whenever, although you know that God would not have given you a love of truth without giving you the means by which to attain it—you yet despairingly renounce every effort to discover it, and accept as truth, without examination, the assertions either of the temporal powers, or of the priest who has sold himself to them.

God, the *Father and Educator of Humanity*, reveals his Law to Humanity through time and space. Interrogate the tradition of Humanity,—which is the Council of your brother men,—not in the restricted circle of an age or sect, but in all ages, and in the majority of mankind past and present. *Whensoever that consent of Humanity corresponds with the teachings of your own conscience, you are certain of the Truth*—certain, that is, of having read one line of the law of God.

I believe in Humanity, sole interpreter of the law of God on earth; and from the consent of Humanity, in harmony with my individual conscience, I deduce what I am now about to tell you with regard to your duties.

CHAPTER IV.

DUTIES TOWARDS HUMANITY.

YOUR first duties—first, not as to time, but as to importance; because unless you understand these, you can only imperfectly fulfil the rest—your first duties are towards Humanity. You have duties as citizens, as sons, as husbands, and as fathers; duties sacred and inviolable, and of which I shall shortly speak to you in

detail; but that which constitutes the sacredness and inviolability of these duties is, the mission, the duty springing from your *Human* nature.

You are fathers in order that you may educate men in the worship and fulfilment of the law of God. You are citizens, you have a country, in order that in a given and limited sphere of action, the concourse and assistance of a certain number of men, already related to you by language, tendencies, and customs, may enable you to labour more effectually for the good of *all men*, present and to come; a task in which your solitary effort would be lost, falling powerless and unheeded amid the immense multitude of your fellow-beings.

They who pretend to teach you morality while limiting your duties to those you owe to your family and to your Country, do but teach you a more or less enlarged egotism, tending to the injury of others and yourself. The Family and the Fatherland are like two circles drawn within a larger circle which contains them both: they are two steps of the ladder you have to climb; without them your ascent is impossible, but upon them it is forbidden to rest.

You are *men:* that is to say, creatures capable of rational, social, and intellectual progress, *solely through the medium of association:* a progress to which none may assign a limit.

This is all we as yet know with regard to the law of life of Humanity. These characteristics constitute *human* nature: these characteristics distinguish you from the different creatures that surround you, and are given to each of you as the germ you are bound to fructify. Your whole life should tend to the organized development and exercise of these faculties of your nature. Whensoever you suppress, or allow to be suppressed, one

of these faculties, whether completely or partially, you descend from the rank of men to that of the inferior animals, and violate your law of life, the Law of God. You descend to the level of the brutes whenever you suppress, or allow to be suppressed, any of the faculties that constitute human nature, either in yourself or others. God wills that you shall fulfil his law not as individuals alone. Had he intended this, he would have created you solitary. He wills that the Law be fulfilled over the whole earth, among all the creatures He created after his own image. He wills that the divine idea of perfectibility and love which he has incarnated in the World, shall be revealed in ever-increasing brightness, and worshipped, through its gradual realization, by His creatures.

In your terrestrial existence, limited both in education and capacity, the realization of this Divine Idea can only be most imperfect and momentary. Humanity only,—continuous in existence through the passing generations, continuous in intellect through the contributions of all its members,—is capable of gradually evolving, applying, and glorifying the Divine Idea.

Life therefore was given to you by God in order that you might employ that life for the benefit of Humanity; that you might direct your individual faculties to aid the development of the faculties of your brother men, and contribute by your labour another element to the collective work of Progress, and the discovery of the truth, which the generations are destined slowly but unceasingly to promote. Your duty is to educate yourselves, and to educate others; to strive to perfect yourselves, and to perfect others.

It is true that God lives within you, but God lives in all the men by whom this earth is peopled. God is in

the life of all the generations that have been, are, and are to be. Past generations have progressively improved, and coming generations will continue to improve the conception which Humanity forms of Him, of his Law, and of our duties. You are bound to adore Him and to glorify Him wheresoever He manifests his presence. The Universe is his Temple, and the sin of every unresisted or unexpiated profanation of the Temple weighs on the head of each and all of the Believers.

It is of no avail to assert your own purity, even were true purity possible in isolation. Whensoever you see corruption by your side, and do not strive against it, you betray your duty. It is of no avail that you worship truth; if you see your brother men ruled by error in some other portion of the earth—our common mother—and you do not both desire and endeavour, as far as lies in your power, to overcome that error, you betray your duty.

The image of God is disfigured in the immortal souls of your fellow-men. God wills to be adored through His Law, and His law is violated and misinterpreted around you. Human nature is falsified in the millions of men to whom, even as to you, God has confided the associate fulfilment of His design. And do you dare to call yourselves *believers* while you remain inert?

A People—Greek, Pole, Italian, or Circassian—raises the flag of country and independence, and combats, conquers or dies to defend it. What is it that causes your hearts to beat at the news of those battles, that makes them swell with joy at their victories, and sink with sorrow at their defeats? A man—it may be a foreigner in some remote corner of the world—arises, and amidst the universal silence, gives utterance to certain ideas which he believes to be true; maintains them through-

out persecution, and in chains, or dies upon the scaffold, and denies them not. Wherefore do you honour that man, and call him saint and martyr? Why do you respect, and teach your children to respect his memory? Why do you read so eagerly the prodigies of patriotism registered in Grecian history, and relate them to your children with a sense of pride, as if they belonged to the history of your ancestors?

Those deeds of Greece are two thousand years old, and belong to an epoch of civilisation which is not, and never can be, yours. Those men whom you still call martyrs, perhaps died for a faith which is not yours, and certainly their death cut short their every hope of individual progress on earth. That people whom you admire, in its victories or in its fall, is a foreign people, almost unknown to you, and speaking a strange tongue. Their way of life has no influence on yours. What matters it, then, to you, whether they be ruled by Pope or Sultan, by the King of Bavaria, the Czar of Russia, or a free government sprung from the consent of the nation?

It is that there is in your heart a voice that cries unto you: "Those men of two thousand years ago, those populations now fighting afar off, that martyr for an idea for which you would not die, are your brothers; brothers not only in community of origin and of nature, but in community of labour and of aim. Those Greeks passed away, but their deeds remained; and were it not for them, you would not have reached your present degree of moral and intellectual development. Those populations consecrate with their blood an idea of national liberty for which you too would combat. That martyr proclaimed by his death that man is bound to sacrifice all things, and, if need be, life itself, for that which he believes to be truth. What matters it that he, and all

of those who thus seal their faith with their blood, cut short their individual progress on earth? God will provide for them elsewhere. But it is of import that the coming generation, taught by your struggles and your sacrifice, may arise stronger and nobler than you have been, in fuller comprehension of the Law, in greater adoration of the truth. It is of import that human nature, fortified by these examples, may improve, develope, and realize still further the Design of God on earth. And wheresoever human nature shall improve or develope, wheresoever a new truth be discovered, wheresoever a step be taken on the path of education, progress, and morality;—that step taken, and that truth discovered, will sooner or later benefit all humanity.

"You are all soldiers in one army: an army which is advancing by different paths, and divided into different corps, to the conquest of one sole aim. As yet you only look to your immediate leaders; diversity of uniform and of watchword, the distances which separate the different bodies of troops, and the mountains that conceal them one from another, frequently cause you to forget this great truth, and concentrate your thoughts exclusively on your own immediate goal. But there is One above you who sees the whole and directs all your movements. God alone has the plan of the battle, and he at length will unite you in a single camp, beneath a single banner."

How great is the distance between this faith, which thrills within our souls, and which will be the basis of the morality of the coming Epoch, and the faith that was the basis of the morality of the generations of what we term antiquity! And how intimate is the connection between the idea we form of the Divine Government and that we form of our own duties!

The first men *felt* God, but without comprehending or even seeking to comprehend Him in His law. They felt Him in His power, not in His love. They conceived a confused idea of some sort of relation between Him and their own individuality, but nothing beyond this. Able to withdraw themselves but little from the sphere of visible objects, they sought to incarnate Him in one of these: in the tree they had seen struck by the thunderbolt, the rock beside which they had raised their tent, the animal which first presented itself before them. This was the worship which in the history of Religions is termed *Fetishism.*

In those days men comprehended nothing beyond the *Family,* the reproduction in a certain form of their own individuality: all beyond the family circle were strangers, or more often enemies: to aid themselves and their families was to them the sole foundation of morality.

In later days the idea of God was enlarged. From visible objects men timidly raised their thoughts to abstractions; they learned to generalize. God was no longer regarded as the Protector of the family only, but of the association of many families, of the cities, of the peoples. Thus to *fetishism* succeeded *polytheism,* the worship of many gods. The sphere of action of morality was also enlarged. Men recognised the existence of more extended duties than those due to the family alone; they strove for the advancement of the *people,* of the *nation.* Yet, nevertheless, Humanity was still ignored. Each nation stigmatised foreigners as *barbarians,* regarded them as such, and endeavoured to conquer or oppress them by force or fraud. Each nation also contained foreigners or barbarians within its own circle; millions of men not admitted to join in the

religious rites of the citizens, and believed to be of an inferior nature; slaves among free men. The idea of the Unity of the human race could only be conceived as a consequence of the Unity of God. And the Unity of God, though forefelt by a few rare thinkers of antiquity, and openly declared by Moses (but with the fatal restriction of believing one sole people His elect) was not a recognised creed until towards the close of the Roman Empire, and through the teachings of Christianity.

Foremost and grandest amid the teachings of Christ were these two inseparable truths—*There is but one God*; *All men are the sons of God*; and the promulgation of these two truths changed the face of the world, and enlarged the moral circle to the confines of the inhabited globe. To the duties of men towards the Family and Country were added duties towards Humanity. Man then learned that wheresoever there existed a human being, there existed a brother; a brother with a soul immortal as his own, destined like himself to ascend towards the Creator, and on whom he was bound to bestow love, a knowledge of the faith, and help and counsel when needed.

Then did the Apostles utter words of sublime import, in prevision of those great truths of which the germ was contained in Christianity; truths which have been misunderstood or betrayed by their successors. "*For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another*" (St Paul, Rom. xii. 4, 5).

"*And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd*" (St John, x. 16).

And at the present day, after eighteen hundred years of labour, study, and experience, we have yet to develope these germs, we have yet to apply these truths, not only to *each* individual, but to all that complex sum of human forces and faculties, present and future, which is named humanity. We have yet to teach mankind not only that Humanity is one sole being, and must be governed by one sole law, but that the first article of the law is *Progress*;—progress here, on this earth, where we are bound to realize, as far as in us lies, the design of God, and educate ourselves for higher destinies.

We have yet to teach mankind that as humanity is one sole body, all we, being members of that body, are bound to labour for its development, and to seek to render its life more harmonious, vigorous, and active. We have yet to be convinced that we can only elevate ourselves towards God through the souls of our fellow-men, and that it is our duty to improve and purify them, even though they seek not such improvement and purification. And we have yet—since only by entire humanity can the design of God be fully accomplished here below—we have yet to substitute a work of *association* tending to elevate the mass, for the exercise of *charity* towards individuals, and to organize both the family and the country to that aim.

Other and vaster duties will be revealed to us in the future, in proportion as we acquire a clearer and less imperfect conception of our law of life.

Thus does God, the Father, by means of a slow but uninterrupted religious education, direct the advance of Humanity, and our individual improvement corresponds with that advance.

Our individual improvement corresponds with that advance; nor, without the advance and improvement of

the whole, may you hope for any lasting improvement in your moral or material individual condition. Strictly speaking, you cannot, even if you would, separate your life from that of humanity. You live in it, by it, and for it. Your souls—with the exception of certain men of extraordinary power—cannot rid themselves of the influence of the elements amongst which they move: even as your bodies, however robust, cannot rid themselves of the effects of the corrupt air by which they are surrounded. How many are there among you, who, knowing that they thereby expose them to persecution, yet strive to educate their children to absolute truthfulness, in a society where ignorance or prejudice enforces silence or concealment of two-thirds of their opinions? How many of you strive to teach them to despise wealth in a society wherein gold is the sole power that obtains respect, influence, and honour? What mother is there among you, who, although belonging to that faith which adores in Christ the voluntary martyr for humanity, yet would not throw her arms round her son's neck, and seek to wean him from all perilous endeavour to benefit his brother men?

And even should you have strength to teach the better lesson, would not all Society, with its thousand tongues and thousands of evil examples, destroy the effect of your words? Can you purify and exalt your own souls in an atmosphere of moral degradation and contagion? Or—to descend to your material condition—think you it can be duly ameliorated, unless by the amelioration of all?

Here in England, where I now write, millions of pounds sterling are annually bestowed in private charity, for the relief of individual misery; yet that misery annually increases, and private charity is proved

impotent to meet the evil, and the necessity of collective organic remedies is ever more universally acknowledged. And in countries despotically governed, where taxes and restrictions are imposed at the sole caprice of the ruler, the cost of whose armies, spies, agents, and pensioners, is continually increasing, as the necessity of providing for the safety of the despotism increases, think you that a constant activity and development of industry and manufactures is possible? Think you that it will suffice to improve the government and social condition of your own country? No, it will not suffice. No nation lives exclusively on its own produce at the present day. You live by exchanges, by importation and exportation. A foreign nation impoverished, and in which the cipher of consumers is diminished, is one market the less for you. A foreign commerce ruined in consequence of evil administration, produces mischief and crises in your own. Failures in America and elsewhere, entail failures in England. Credit now-a-days is no longer a national but a European institution.

Moreover, all other governments will be hostile to your national improvements, for there is an alliance among the princes, who were among the first to understand that the social question has become a general question at the present day.

The only lasting hope for you is in the general amelioration, improvement, and fraternity of all the peoples of Europe, and, through Europe, of Humanity.

Therefore, my brothers, in the name of your duty, and for the sake of your interest, never forget that your first duties—duties without fulfilling which, you cannot rightly fulfil those towards your country and family—are towards Humanity.

Let your words and your actions be for all men, as

God is for all men in His Law and Love. In whatsoever land you live, wheresoever there arises a man to combat for the right, the just, and the true, that man is your brother. Wheresoever a man is tortured through error, injustice, or tyranny, that man is your brother. Free men or slaves, you are all brothers. You are one in origin, one in the divine law that governs you, and one in the goal you are destined to attain. Your faith must be one, your actions one, and one the banner under which you combat. Say not, *The language we speak is different.* Acts, tears, and martyrdom, are a language common to all men, and which all understand. Say not, *Humanity is too vast, and we are too weak.* God does not judge the power, but the intention. Love Humanity. Ask yourselves, as to every act you commit within the circle of family or country: *If what I now do were done by and for all men, would it be beneficial or injurious to humanity?* and if your conscience tell you it would be injurious, desist: desist, even though it seem that an immediate advantage to your country or family would be the result.

Be you the Apostles of this faith: apostles of the fraternity of nations, and of that Unity of the human race, which, though it be admitted in principle, is denied in practice, at the present day. Be such, wheresoever and howsoever you are able. Neither God nor man can require more of you than this. But I tell you that by becoming such, and even—should more be impossible—by becoming such to yourselves alone, you will yet serve Humanity. God measures the stages of education He permits the human race to ascend, by the number and the purity of the believers. When the pure among you are many, God, who numbers you, will disclose to you the way to action.

CHAPTER V.

1858.

DUTIES TOWARDS YOUR COUNTRY.

YOUR first duties—first as regards importance—are, as I have already told you, towards Humanity. You are *men* before you are either citizens or fathers. If you do not embrace the whole human family in your affection, if you do not bear witness to your belief in the Unity of that family, consequent upon the Unity of God, and in that fraternity among the peoples which is destined to reduce that unity to action; if, wheresoever a fellow-creature suffers, or the dignity of human nature is violated by falsehood or tyranny—you are not ready, if able, to aid the unhappy, and do not feel called upon to combat, if able, for the redemption of the betrayed or oppressed—you violate your law of life, you comprehend not that Religion which will be the guide and blessing of the future.

But what can each of you, singly, *do* for the moral improvement and progress of Humanity? You can from time to time give sterile utterance to your belief; you may, on some rare occasions, perform some act of *charity* towards a brother man not belonging to your own land;—no more. But charity is not the watchword of the Faith of the Future. The watchword of the faith of the future is *Association*, and fraternal co-operation of all towards a common aim; and this is as far superior to all charity, as the edifice which all of you should unite to raise would be superior to the humble hut each one of you might build alone, or with the mere assistance of lending and borrowing stone, mortar, and tools.

But, you tell me, you cannot attempt united action, distinct and divided as you are in language, customs, tendencies, and capacity. The individual is too insignificant, and Humanity too vast. The mariner of Brittany prays to God as he puts to sea: *Help me, my God! my boat is so small and thy ocean so wide!* And this prayer is the true expression of the condition of each one of you, until you find the means of infinitely multiplying your forces and powers of action.

This means was provided for you by God when he gave you a country; when, even as a wise overseer of labour distributes the various branches of employment according to the different capacities of the workmen, he divided Humanity into distinct groups or nuclei upon the face of the earth, thus creating the germ of Nationalities. Evil governments have disfigured the divine design. Nevertheless you may still trace it, distinctly marked out—at least as far as Europe is concerned—by the course of the great rivers, the direction of the higher mountains, and other geographical conditions. They have disfigured it by their conquests, their greed, and their jealousy even of the righteous power of others; disfigured it so far that, if we except England and France—there is not perhaps a single country whose present boundaries correspond to that design.

These governments did not, and do not, recognise any country save their own families or dynasty, the egotism of caste. But the Divine design will infallibly be realized. Natural divisions, and the spontaneous, innate tendencies of the peoples, will take the place of the arbitrary divisions sanctioned by evil governments. The map of Europe will be re-drawn. The countries of the Peoples, defined by the vote of free men, will arise upon the ruins of the countries of kings and privileged castes,

and between these countries harmony and fraternity will exist. And the common work of Humanity, of general amelioration and the gradual discovery and application of its Law of life, being distributed according to local and general capacities, will be wrought out in peaceful and progressive development and advance. Then may each one of you, fortified by the power and the affection of many millions, all speaking the same language, gifted with the same tendencies, and educated by the same historical tradition, hope, even by your own single effort, to be able to benefit all Humanity.

O my brothers, love your Country! Our country is our Home, the house that God has given us, placing therein a numerous family that loves us, and whom we love; a family with whom we sympathise more readily, and whom we understand more quickly than we do others; and which, from its being centred round a given spot, and from the homogeneous nature of its elements, is adapted to a special branch of activity. Our country is our common workshop, whence the products of our activity are sent forth for the benefit of the whole world; wherein the tools and implements of labour we can most usefully employ are gathered together: nor may we reject them without disobeying the plan of the Almighty, and diminishing our own strength.

In labouring for our own country on the right principle, we labour for Humanity. Our country is the fulcrum of the lever we have to wield for the common good. If we abandon that fulcrum, we run the risk of rendering ourselves useless not only to humanity but to our country itself. Before men can *associate* with the nations of which humanity is composed, they must have a National existence. There is no true association except among equals. It is only through our

country that we can have a recognised *collective* existence.

Humanity is a vast army advancing to the conquest of lands unknown, against enemies both powerful and astute. The peoples are the different corps, the divisions of that army. Each of them has its post assigned to it, and its special operation to execute; and the common victory depends upon the exactitude with which those distinct operations shall be fulfilled. Disturb not the order of battle. Forsake not the banner given to you by God. Wheresoever you may be, in the centre of whatsoever people circumstances may have placed you, be ever ready to combat for the liberty of that people should it be necessary, but combat in such wise that the blood you shed may reflect glory, not on yourselves alone, but on your country. Say not *I*, but *we*. Let each man among you strive to incarnate his country in himself. Let each man among you regard himself as a guarantee, responsible for his fellow-countrymen, and learn so to govern his actions as to cause his country to be loved and respected through him. Your country is the sign of the mission God has given you to fulfil towards Humanity. The faculties and forces of *all* her sons should be associated in the accomplishment of that mission. The true country is a community of free men and equals, bound together in fraternal concord to labour towards a common aim. You are bound to make it and to maintain it such. The country is not an *aggregation*, but an *association*. There is therefore no true country without an uniform right. There is no true country where the uniformity of that right is violated by the existence of castes, privilege, and inequality. Where the activity of a portion of the powers and faculties of the individual is either cancelled or dormant;

where there is not a common Principle, recognised, accepted, and developed by all, there is no true nation, no People; but only a multitude, a fortuitous agglomeration of men whom circumstances have called together, and whom circumstances may again divide. In the name of the love you bear your country you must peacefully but untiringly combat the existence of privilege and inequality in the land that gave you life.

There is but one sole legitimate privilege, the privilege of Genius when it reveals itself united with virtue. But this is a privilege given by God, and when you acknowledge it and follow its inspiration, you do so freely, exercising your own reason and your own choice. Every privilege which demands submission from you in virtue of power, inheritance, or any other right than the Right common to all, is a usurpation and a tyranny which you are bound to resist and destroy.

Be your country your Temple. God at the summit; a people of equals at the base.

Accept no other formula, no other moral law, if you would not dishonour alike your country and yourselves. Let all secondary laws be but the gradual regulation of your existence by the progressive application of this supreme law. And in order that they may be such, it is necessary that *all* of you should aid in framing them. Laws framed only by a single fraction of the citizens, can never, in the very nature of things, be other than the mere expression of the thoughts, aspirations, and desires of that fraction; the representation, not of the Country, but of a third or fourth part, of a class or zone of the country.

The laws should be the expression of the *universal* aspiration, and promote the universal good. They should be a pulsation of the heart of the nation.

The entire nation should, either directly or indirectly, legislate.

By yielding up this mission into the hands of a few, you substitute the egotism of one class for the Country, which is the union of all classes.

Country is not a mere zone of territory. The true country is the Idea to which it gives birth; it is the Thought of love, the sense of communion which unites in one all the sons of that territory.

So long as a single one amongst your brothers has no vote to represent him in the development of the national life, so long as there is one left to vegetate in ignorance where others are educated, so long as a single man, able and willing to work, languishes in poverty through want of work to do, you have no country in the sense in which country ought to exist—the country of all and for all.

Education, labour, and the franchise, are the three main pillars of the nation. Rest not until you have built them strongly up with your own labour and exertions.

Never deny your sister nations. Be it yours to evolve the life of your country in loveliness and strength; free from all servile fears or sceptical doubts; maintaining as its basis the People; as its guide the consequences of the principles of its Religious Faith, logically and energetically applied; its strength, the united strength of all; its aim, the fulfilment of the mission given to it by God.

And so long as you are ready to die for Humanity, the life of your country will be immortal.

CHAPTER VI.

DUTIES TOWARDS THE FAMILY.

THE Family is the Heart's Fatherland. There is in the Family an Angel, possessed of a mysterious influence of grace, sweetness, and love; an Angel who renders our duties less arid, and our sorrows less bitter. The only pure and unalloyed happiness, the only joys untainted by grief granted to man on this earth, are—thanks be given to this Angel!—the happiness and the joys of the family. He who, from some fatality of position, has been unable to live the calm life of the family, sheltered beneath this Angel's wing, has a shadow of sadness cast over his soul, and a void in his heart which nought can fill, as I who write these pages for you, know.

Bless the God who created this Angel, O you who share the joys and consolations of the family! Hold them not in light esteem, because you fancy you might find more ardent pleasures and more facile consolations elsewhere. There is in the family an element rarely found elsewhere—the element of durability. Family affections wind themselves round your heart slowly and all unobserved, but, tenacious and enduring as the ivy round the tree, they cling to you, hour by hour, mingling with and becoming a portion of your very existence. Very often you are unconscious of them, because they are a part of yourselves; but when once you lose them, you feel as if an intimate and necessary portion of your life were gone. You wander restless and unhappy; it may be that you again succeed in finding some brief delights or consolations, but never the supreme consolation of calm: the calm of the waters

of the lake, the calm of trusting sleep, a repose like that of the child on its mother's breast.

This Angel of the family is Woman. Whether as mother, wife, or sister, woman is the caress of existence, the soft sweetness of affection diffused over its fatigues, a reflex on the individual of that loving Providence which watches over Humanity. She has in her a treasure of gentle consolation sufficient to soothe every sorrow. Moreover, she is for each of us the Initiatrix of the future. The child learns its first lesson of love from its mother's kiss. In the first sacred kiss of the beloved one, man learns the lesson of hope and faith in life, and hope and faith create that yearning after progress, and that power to achieve it step by step—that *future*, in short—whose living symbol is the infant, our link with the generations to come. It is through woman that the family—with its divine mystery of reproduction—points to Eternity.

Hold then the family sacred, my brothers! Look upon it as one of the indestructible conditions of life, and reject every attempt made to undermine it, either by men imbued with a false and brutish philosophy, or by shallow thinkers, who, irritated at seeing it too often made the nursery of egotism and the spirit of caste, imagine, like the savage, that the sole remedy for this evil growth is the destruction of the tree itself.

The conception of the family is not human, but divine, and no human power can extinguish it. Like the Fatherland—even more than the Fatherland—the family is an element of existence.

I have said even more than the Fatherland. Distinctions of country—sacred now—may possibly disappear whenever man shall bear the moral law of Humanity inscribed upon his own heart, but the family

will endure while man himself endures. It is the cradle of Humanity. Like every other element of human life, it is, of course, susceptible of progress, and from epoch to epoch its tendencies and aspirations are improved, but it can never be cancelled. Your mission is ever more to sanctify the family, and to link it ever more closely with the country. That which the country is to Humanity, the family must be to the country. Even as the scope and object of our love of country is, as I have told you, to educate you as *men*, so the scope and object of the family is to educate you as *citizens*. The family and the country are the two extreme points of one and the same line. And wheresoever this is not the case, the family degenerates into egotism; an egotism the more odious and brutal, inasmuch as it prostitutes and perverts from their true aim the most sacred things that be—our affections.

Love and respect Women. Seek in her not merely a comfort, but a force, an inspiration, the redoubling of your intellectual and moral faculties.

Cancel from your minds every idea of superiority over Woman. You have none whatsoever.

Long prejudice, an inferior education, and a perennial legal inequality and injustice, have created that *apparent* intellectual inferiority which has been converted into an argument of continued oppression.

But does not the history of every oppression teach us how the oppressor ever seeks his justification and support by appealing to a *fact* of his own creation? The feudal castes that withheld education from the sons of the people, excluded them on the grounds of that very want of education, from the rights of the citizen, from the sanctuary wherein laws are framed, and from that right of vote which is the initiation of their social

mission. The Slaveholders of America declare the black race radically inferior and incapable of education, and yet persecute those who seek to instruct them. For half-a-century the supporters of the reigning families in Italy have declared the Italians unfit for freedom,* and meanwhile, by their laws, and by the brute force of hireling armies, they close every path through which we might overcome the obstacles to our improvement, where such really exist, as if tyranny could ever be a means of educating men for liberty.

Now, we men have ever been, and still are, guilty of a similar crime towards woman. Avoid even the shadow or semblance of this crime: there is none heavier in the sight of God, for it divides the human family into two classes, and imposes or accepts the subjugation of one class to the other.

In the sight of God the Father there is neither *man* nor *woman*. There is only the *human* being, that being in whom, whether the form be of male or female, those characteristics which distinguish humanity from the brute creation are united—namely, the social tendency, and the capacity of education and progress.

Wheresoever these characteristics exist, the *human* nature is revealed, and thence perfect equality both of rights and of duties.

Like two distinct branches springing from the same trunk, man and woman are varieties springing from the common basis—Humanity. There is no inequality between them; but, even as is often the case among men, diversity of tendency and of special vocation. Are two notes of the same musical chord unequal or of different nature? Man and woman are the two notes without which the Human chord is impossible.

* Written in 1858.

Suppose two peoples,—one of which is called by circumstances and by special tendencies to the mission of diffusing the idea of human association by means of colonisation, and the other to teach that idea by the production of universally-admired literature and art: are their general rights and duties therefore different? Both of these peoples are, consciously or unconsciously, Apostles of the same Divine idea, equals and brothers in that idea.

Man and Woman, even as these two peoples, fulfil different functions in Humanity, but these functions are equally sacred; equally manifestations of that Thought of God which He has made the soul of the universe.

Consider woman, therefore, as the partner and companion, not merely of your joys and sorrows, but of your thoughts, your aspirations, your studies, and your endeavours after social amelioration. Consider her your equal in your civil and political life. Be ye the two human wings that lift the soul towards the Ideal we are destined to attain. The Mosaic Bible has declared: *God created man, and woman from man;* but your Bible, the Bible of the Future, will proclaim that *God created Humanity, made manifest in the woman and the man.**

Love the children given to you by God, but love them with a true, deep, and earnest affection; not with the enervated, blind, unreasoning love, which is but egotism in you, and ruin to them. In the name of all that is most sacred, never forget that through them you have in charge the future generations; that towards them, as souls confided to your keeping, towards Humanity, and before God, you are under the heaviest responsibility known to mankind. You are bound to

* Appendix C.

initiate your children, not merely to the joys and desires of life, but to life itself; to its duties, and to its moral law of government. Few mothers, few fathers, in this irreligious age—and even especially in the wealthier classes—understand the true gravity of their educational mission. Few mothers, few fathers, remember that the numerous victims, the incessant struggles, and the life-long martyrdoms of our day, are in a great measure the fruit of the *egotism* instilled thirty years back by the weak mothers and heedless fathers who allowed their children to accustom themselves to regard life, not as a mission and a duty, but as a search after happiness, and a study of their own wellbeing. For you, the sons of labour, these dangers are less: the greater number of you know only too well what it is to live the life of privation. But, compelled by your inferior social position to constant toil, you are also less able to bestow upon your children a fitting education. Nevertheless, even you can in part fulfil your arduous mission, both by word and by example.

You can do it by example.

"Your children will resemble you, and become corrupt or virtuous in proportion as you are yourself corrupt or virtuous. How shall they become honest, charitable, and humane, if you are without charity for your brothers? How shall they restrain their grosser appetites, if they see you given up to intemperance? How shall they preserve their native innocence, if you shrink not from offending their modesty by indecent act or obscene word? You are the living model by which their pliant nature is fashioned. It depends then upon you, whether your children be men or brutes." (Lamennais, *Words of a Believer*).

And you may educate your children by your words.

Speak to them of your country; of what she was, and is, and ought to be. At evening, when beneath the smile of their mother, and amid the innocent prattle of your children seated on your knee, you forget the day's fatigue, repeat to them the names and deeds of the good men who have loved their country and the people, and who have striven, amid sorrows, calumny, and persecution, to elevate their destiny. Instil into their young hearts the strength to resist injustice and oppression. Let them learn from your lips, and the calm approval of their mother, how lovely is the path of virtue; how noble it is to become apostles of the truth, how holy to sacrifice themselves, if need be, for their fellows. Infuse into their tender minds, not merely the energy of resistance to every false or unjust authority, but due reverence for the sole legitimate and true authority—that of virtue crowned by genius. See that they grow up enemies alike to tyranny and anarchy, and in the Religion of a conscience inspired, but not enchained by tradition.

The nation is bound to aid you in this work. And you have a right to exact this aid in your children's name. There is no true nation without a National education.

Love and reverence your Parents. Let not the family that issues from you make you unmindful of that from which you sprang. Too often do the new ties weaken the old, whereas they should be but another link in the chain of love that should unite the three generations of the family in one. Surround the gray hairs of your mother and father with tender affection and respectful care even to their last day. Strew their path to the tomb with flowers. Let your constant love shed a perfume of faith and immortality over their weary souls. And be the affection you bestow on your own parents a pledge of that you shall receive from your children.

Parents, sisters, brothers, wives, and children, be they all to you as branches springing from the same stem. Sanctify the family by unity of love, and make of it the Temple wherein you unite to bear sacrifice to your country.

I know not whether you will be happy if you act thus; but I do know that even in the midst of adversity you will find that serene peace of the heart, that repose of the tranquil conscience, which will give you strength in every trial, and cheer your souls with a glimpse of heavenly azure even in the darkest storm.

CHAPTER VII.

DUTIES TOWARDS YOURSELVES.

I HAVE already said to you: *You have life, therefore you have a Law of life. To develope yourselves, to act and live according to your Law of life, is your first or rather your sole Duty.*

I have told you that God has given you two means of arriving at a knowledge of your law of life. He has given you your own conscience, and the conscience of Humanity, the common consent of your fellow-men. I have told you that whenever, on interrogating your own conscience, you find its voice in harmony with the mighty voice of the human race transmitted to you by history, you may be certain of holding an immutable and eternal truth.

At present it is difficult for you fitly to interrogate this mighty voice of Humanity transmitted by history. You are in want of really good popular books on this subject, or you have not time to study them. But the men whose intellect and virtue have rendered them the

best exponents of historical study, and of the science of Humanity, during the last half century, have deduced from them some of the characteristics of our Law of life.

They have discovered that our human nature is essentially *social*, and susceptible of *education*. They have discerned that as there is, and can be, but one sole God, so there is, and can be, but one sole Law, governing alike *individual* and *collective* man. They have discerned that the fundamental character of this law is PROGRESS.

From this truth—irrefutable, because confirmed by every branch of human knowledge—are deduced all your duties towards yourselves, and also all your rights. The last may be summed up in one, viz.—*the right to be in no way impeded, and to be to a certain extent assisted, in the fulfilment of your duties.* You are, and you feel within you that you are, free agents. All the sophisms of the wretched philosophy that seeks to substitute the doctrine of I know not what fatalism to the cry of our human conscience, avail not to silence the two invincible witnesses in favour of human liberty—*Remorse and Martyrdom.*

From Socrates to Jesus, from Jesus down to the men who, from time to time, still die for their country, all the martyrs of Faith protest against the servile doctrine, and cry aloud unto you: "We also loved life, we also loved the beings who made that life dear, and who implored us to yield. Every impulse of our hearts cried *Live!* But, for the salvation of the generations to come, we *chose* to die."

From Cain down to the vulgar spy of the present day, all the betrayers of their fellows, all the men who have chosen the path of evil, have heard and hear in the depths of their secret soul a voice of blame, disquiet, and

reproof, which says unto them: "*Wherefore did you forsake the right path?*"

You are free agents, and therefore responsible. From this moral liberty results your right to political liberty, your duty to achieve it and maintain it inviolate, and the duty of others not to restrain you therein.

You are susceptible of Education. There is in each of you a certain sum of moral tendencies and intellectual capacity to which education alone can give life and movement, and which, if uneducated, remain inert and sterile, or but reveal themselves by fits, and without regular development. Education is the bread of the soul. Even as physical organic life is unable to flourish and expand without material aliment, so does our moral and intellectual life require for its expansion and manifestation the external influence, and the assimilation—in part at least—of the affections and tendencies of others.

Individual life springs up like the flower. Each variety is gifted with a special existence and a special character, upon the common soil, and is nourished by the elements common to the life of all. The individual is an offshoot of Humanity, and aliments and renews its vital forces in the vital force of Humanity. This work of alimentation and renovation is accomplished by Education, which transmits (directly or indirectly) to the individual, the results of the progress of the whole human race. Education therefore is not merely a necessity of your true *life;* it is also as a holy communion with your fellow-men, with the generations who lived (that is to say, thought and acted) before you, that you are bound to obtain for yourselves a moral and intellectual education, which shall embrace and fecundate all the faculties which God has given you, even as seed to fructify, and

wherewith to constitute and maintain the link between your individual life and the life of collective Humanity.

And in order that this work of education may be more rapidly achieved, in order that your individual life may be more intimately and surely linked with the collective life of your brothers—the life of Humanity—God has created you beings eminently social.

Each of the inferior beings *can* live alone, without communion save with Nature, with the elements of the physical world. You cannot. You have need of your brother men at every step, and cannot satisfy the simplest wants of your existence without aiding yourself by their work. Superior to all other beings when in association with your fellows, you are, when isolated, inferior in force to many of the lower animals, weak, and incapable of development and of fulness of life. All the noblest aspirations of your heart—such as love of country—even the least elevated—such as the desire of glory and praise—indicate your innate tendency to mingle your existence with the life of the millions by whom you are surrounded.

You are then created for *Association*.

Association centuples your strength; it makes the thoughts of others, and the progress of others, your own, while it elevates and sanctifies your nature through the affections, and the growing sentiment of the unity of the human family. In proportion as your association with your brother men is extended, in proportion as it is intimate and comprehensive, will you advance on the path of individual improvement. The law of life cannot be fulfilled in its entirety, save by the united labour of all. For every step taken in progress, for every new discovery of a portion of that law, history shows a corresponding extension of human association, a more

extended contact and communication between peoples and peoples.

Before the first Christians came to declare the unity of human nature, in opposition to the pagan philosophy that admitted two human natures (that of the master and that of the slave), the Roman people had already carried their eagles across all the known countries of Europe.

Before the papacy (baleful to mankind at the present day, but useful during the first ages of its institution) proclaimed *the superiority of Spiritual to Temporal Authority*, the barbarian invaders had violently brought into contact the Latin and Germanic worlds.

Before the idea of liberty—as applied not only to individuals but to peoples—had produced the conception of nationality which now agitates and is destined to triumph in Europe, the wars of the Revolution and the Empire, had aroused and called into action an element until then remote, the Slavonian peoples.

Finally, you are *progressive* beings.

This word of PROGRESS, unknown to antiquity, is destined henceforth to be a sacred word to Humanity. In it is included an entire social, political, and religious transformation. The ancients, the men of the old Oriental and Pagan religions, believed in fate, in chance, in a hidden incomprehensible power, the arbitrator of human things; a Power alternately creator and destroyer, the action of which man was neither able to understand, accelerate, nor promote. They believed man to be incapable of founding any stable or permanent work on earth. They believed that nations, destined to move for ever in a circle, similar to that described by individuals here below, arose, became powerful, and sank in decay, doomed infallibly to perish.

With a mental horizon thus restricted, and destitute of all historical knowledge save that of their own nation, or it might be of their own city, they regarded the human race as a mere aggregate of men, without any general collective life or law, and based their ideas solely upon the contemplation of the individual. The natural consequence of such a doctrine was a disposition to accept all dominant and ruling *facts*, without hoping or endeavouring to modify them. Where circumstances had produced a republican form of government, the men of that day were republicans; where despotism existed, they were its submissive slaves, indifferent to progress. And both under the republican and tyrannic governments, the human family was everywhere divided, either into four castes, as in the East, or into two (the free citizens and the slaves), as in Greece. This division into castes, and the doctrine of the two natures of men, were accepted by all, even by the most powerful intellects of the Greek world, Plato and Aristotle. The emancipation of your class would have been an impossibility among such men as these.

The men who, with the word of Christ upon their lips, founded a religion superior to Paganism or the religions of the East, had but dimly foreseen, not grasped or assimilated, the sacred idea contained in this word *Progress*. They understood the idea of the unity of the human race, and the unity of the Law; they understood the idea of the perfectibility of man, but they did not comprehend that God has given man the power of realizing it by his *own* efforts, nor the mode by which it has to be achieved. They also limited themselves to deducing the rule of life from the contemplation of the individual. Humanity, as a collective being, remained unknown to them.

They comprehended the idea of a Providence, and

substituted it for the Fatality of the ancients; but in this Providence they saw only the protector of the individual, not the Law of Humanity. Finding themselves placed between the immense ideal of perfectibility they had faintly conceived, and the poor brief life of the individual, they felt the necessity of an intermediate term or link between man and God; but, not having reached the idea of Collective humanity, they had recourse to that of a divine incarnation, and declared faith in this dogma to be the sole source of strength, of salvation, of *grace* to man.

Not suspecting the *continuous* Revelation transmitted from God to man, through Humanity, they believed in an unique, immediate revelation, vouchsafed at a particular time, and by a special favour of God. They perceived the link that unites man with his Creator, but they perceived not the link that unites all men, past, present, and future, in Humanity on earth.

The sequence of generations being of little moment to those who comprehended nothing of the action of one generation on another, they accustomed themselves to disregard it. They endeavoured to detach man from the earth, from all that regarded Humanity at large, and ended by regarding the earth itself (which they abandoned to the existing Powers, and deemed a mere sojourn of expiation) as in antagonism to that Heaven to which man might, by the help of faith and grace, ascend, but from which all wanting in faith and grace were exiled.

Believing Revelation to have been immediate and *unique* at a given period, they thence deduced the impossibility of all addition thereunto, and the consequent infallibility of its depositaries. They forgot that the Founder of their religion had come, not to destroy

the law, but to add to and continue it; they forgot the solemn occasion when, with a sublime intuition of the future, Jesus declared "that he had many things yet to say, but men could not bear them then, but that after him would come the Spirit of truth, who would speak not of himself, but whatsoever he should hear, that he should speak" (St John xvi. 7, 12, 13, 25, *et passim*); words prophetic of the idea of Progress, of collective inspiration, and of the continuous revelation of the truth through the medium of Humanity.

The whole edifice of the faith that succeeded Paganism is founded on the bases I have described. It is clear that your earthly emancipation cannot be founded upon these bases alone.

Thirteen hundred years after the above sublime words of Jesus were spoken, a man, an Italian, the greatest of Italians, wrote the following truths:

"God is One. The universe is a Thought of God; the universe therefore is also One. All things spring from God. All things participate in the Divine nature, more or less, according to the end for which they are created. Man is the noblest of created things. God has given to man more of his own nature than to the others. Everything that springs from God tends towards that amount of perfectibility of which it is susceptible. The capacity of perfectibility is indefinite in man. Humanity is One. God has created no useless thing. Humanity exists; hence there must be a single aim for *all* men, a work to be achieved by all. The human race must therefore work in unity, so that all the intellectual forces diffused among men may obtain the highest possible development in the sphere of thought and action. There exists therefore one Universal Religion for the human race."

The man who wrote these words was called Dante. Every city of Italy, when Italy shall be free, is bound to raise a monument to his memory, for these ideas contain the germ of the Religion of the future. He wrote thus in Latin and in Italian, in two books, entitled *De Monarchia* and *Il Convito*, works difficult of comprehension, and neglected at the present day even by the literary men of his own country. But ideas, once sown in the intellectual world, never die. Others reap and gather them up, even while forgetting whence they sprang. All men admire the oak, but who thinks of the acorn from which it grew? The germ planted by Dante struck root, was fecundated from time to time by some powerful intellect, and the tree bore fruit towards the close of the last century. The idea of Progress, as the Law of life, accepted, developed, and verified by history and confirmed by science, became the banner of the future. At the present day there is no earnest thinker with whom it is not the cardinal point of his labour and endeavour.

We now know that the law of life is PROGRESS—progress for the individual, progress for Humanity.

Humanity fulfils the law on earth: the individual, on earth and elsewhere.

One sole God, one sole Law. That law has been, is, and will be, gradually but inevitably fulfilled by Humanity from the first moment of its existence.

Truth does not manifest itself suddenly, nor entire.

A continuous Revelation, from epoch to epoch, makes manifest to man a fragment of the truth, a word of the Law.

The discovery of every one of these words modifies human life by a sensible advance on the path of improvement, and constitutes a *belief*, a Faith.

The development of the Religious Idea is then indefinitely progressive, and successive beliefs, each one developing and purifying that idea, contribute, like the columns of a temple, to build up the Pantheon of Humanity, the one grand, sole Religion of our earth.

The men most blessed by God with genius and virtue are its Apostles: the People—the collective sense of Humanity—its Interpreter; accepting that revelation of the truth, transmitting it from generation to generation, and reducing it to practice, by applying it to the different branches and manifestations of human life.

"Humanity is as a man who lives and learns for ever."

Therefore there is not, there cannot be, infallibility either in man or Powers; there is not, there cannot be, any privileged caste of depositaries or interpreters of the Law; there is not, there cannot be, need of any interpreter between God and man, save Humanity.

God, by ordaining the accomplishment of a providential design of progressive education for Humanity, and infusing the instinct of progress into the heart of every man, granted to human nature the capacity and the power to fulfil that design.

Individual man, a free and responsible creature, is able to use or abuse the faculties given to him, in proportion as he follows the path of duty or yields to the seductions of a blind egotism. He may thus delay or accelerate his own progress, but the Providential design can be cancelled by no human means. The education of Humanity *must* be completed. Thus do we even see the barbarian invasions, which from time to time threaten to extinguish the existing civilization, result in a new civilization, superior to the former, and diffused over a wider zone, and even individual tyranny subse-

quently produce a more rapid and vigorous growth of liberty.

Progress, the Law, will be fulfilled on earth even as elsewhere.

There is no antagonism between earth and heaven, and it is blasphemous to imagine that God's work, the *Home* He has given us, may be by us despised, and abandoned to the influence of evil, egotism, or tyranny, without sin.

The earth is no sojourn of expiation. It is the home wherein we are to strive towards the realization of that ideal of the true and just of which each man has in his own soul the germ. It is the ladder towards that condition of Perfection which we can only reach by glorifying God in Humanity, through our own works, and by consecrating ourselves to realize in action all that we may of His design. The judgment that will be held on each of us, and that will either decree our ascent one step on the ladder of Perfection, or doom us mournfully to pursue again the stage already trod, will be founded on the amount of good done to our brothers, on the degree of progress to which we have aided them to ascend.

Association, ever more intimate and more extended with our fellow-men, is the means by which our strength will be multiplied; the field wherein we fulfil our duties, and reduce the law of progress to action. We must strive to make of Humanity one single family, every member of which shall be himself a reflex of the moral law, for the benefit of the others. And as the gradual perfection of Humanity is accomplished from epoch to epoch, from generation to generation, so the perfection of the individual is wrought out from existence to existence, more or less rapidly in proportion to our own labour and effort.

These are some of the truths contained in that word Progress, from which the religion of the future will spring. In its name only can your emancipation be achieved.

CHAPTER VIII.

LIBERTY.

You live. The life which is in you is not the work of chance; the word chance is void of meaning, and was invented to express the ignorance of mankind in certain things. The life which is in you comes from God, and in its progressive development it reveals an intelligent design. Your life, then, has necessarily a scope, an aim.

The *ultimate* aim for which we were created is still unknown to us: it cannot be otherwise; but this is no reason why we should deny its existence. Does the infant know the aim towards which it must tend through the family, the country, and humanity? No; but this aim exists, and we are beginning to comprehend it for him. Humanity is the infant of God: He knows the end and aim towards which it must develope itself.

Humanity is only now beginning to understand that progress is the law. It is beginning vaguely to comprehend somewhat of the universe by which it is surrounded; but the majority of the individuals that compose it are still incapable, through barbarism, slavery, or the absolute absence of all education, of studying that law and obtaining a knowledge of that universe; both of which it is necessary to comprehend before we can truly know ourselves.

Only a minority of the men who people our little

Europe are as yet capable of developing themselves towards the right use and understanding of their own intellectual faculties.

Amongst yourselves, deprived as the greater number of you are of instruction, and bowed down beneath the necessity of an ill-organized physical labour, those faculties lie dormant, and are unable to bring their tribute to raise the pyramid of science. How then should we pretend as yet to understand that which will require the associate labour of the whole? Wherefore rebel against our not having already achieved that which will constitute the last stage of progress, while, few in number, and still disunited, we are but learning to lisp its sacred name?

Let us resign ourselves then to our ignorance of those things which must yet a long while remain inaccessible to us, and let us not in childish anger abandon the study of the truths we may discover. Impatience and human pride have destroyed or misled more souls than deliberate wickedness. This is the truth which the ancients sought to express when they told us how the despot who strove to scale the heavens, succeeded only in building up a Babel of confusion, and how the giants who attacked Olympus, were cast down by the thunderbolt, and buried beneath our volcanic mountains.

That of which it is important to be convinced is this, that whatever be the end and aim towards which we are created, we can only reach it through the progressive development and exercise of our intellectual faculties. Our faculties are the instruments of labour given to us by God. It is therefore a necessity that their development be aided and promoted, and their exercise protected and free.

Without liberty you cannot fulfil any of your duties.

Therefore have you a right to liberty and a duty to wrest it at all risks from whatsoever Power shall seek to withhold or deny it.

Without liberty there is no true morality, because if there be not free choice between good and evil; between devotion to the common progress and the spirit of egotism, there can be no responsibility.

Without liberty there is no true Society, because association between free men and slaves is impossible; there can only exist the rule of the one over the others.

Liberty is sacred, as the individual, of whose life it is the reflex, is sacred. Where liberty is not, life is reduced to a mere organic function, and when man allows the violation of his liberty, he is false to his own nature, and rebels against the decree of God. There is no true liberty whenever a caste, a family, or a man, assumes to rule over others in virtue of a pretended right divine, or from any privilege of birth or riches. Liberty must be for all men, and in the face of all men.

God does not delegate the Sovereign power to any individual. That degree of sovereign power which can be justly represented on this earth, has been entrusted by God to Humanity, to the Nations, to Society. And even that ceases, and is withdrawn from those collective fractions of Humanity, whensoever they cease to wield it for good, and in accordance with the providential design. The sovereign rule therefore exists *of right* in none, the true sovereignty being in the *Aim*, and in those acts which bring us nearer to that. These acts, and the aim towards which we are advancing, must be submitted to the judgment of all. There is not, therefore, there cannot be, any permanent Sovereignty.

The institution which we term Government is merely a Direction, a mission confided to a few in order more

speedily to attain the national intent or Aim; and should that mission be betrayed, the power of direction confided to those few must cease.

Every man called to the Government is an administrator of the common Thought. He should be elected, and be subject to have his election revoked whensoever he misconceives or deliberately opposes that thought.

Therefore, I repeat, there can exist neither family nor caste possessing the governing power in its own right, without a violation of your liberty. How could you call yourselves free, in the face of men possessing the power to command you without your consent? The Republic is then the only logical and truly legitimate form of government.

You have no master save God in heaven, and the People on earth. Whensoever you discover a line of the law, of the will of God, you are bound to bless and obey it. Whensoever the people, the Collective Unity of your brother men, shall declare that such is their belief, you are bound to bow the head, and abstain from any act of rebellion. But there are certain things constituting your own individuality, and which are essential elements of human life. Over these not even the People has any right. No majority may decree tyranny, or destroy or alienate its own freedom. You cannot employ force against the people that should commit this suicidal act, but there exists and lives eternally in each of you a right of protest, in the manner circumstances may suggest.

You must have liberty in all that is indispensable to the moral and material aliment of life: personal liberty, liberty of locomotion, liberty of religious faith; liberty of opinion upon all subjects, liberty of expressing that opinion through the Press, or by any other peaceful

means; liberty of association in order to render that opinion fruitful by cultivation, and by contact with the thoughts and opinions of others; liberty of labour, and of trade and commerce with its produce; all these are things which may not be taken from you (save in a few exceptional cases which it is unnecessary here to enumerate) without your having a right to protest.

No one has any right to imprison you, or subject you to personal espionage or restraint in the name of society, without telling you wherefore, telling it you with the least possible delay, and immediately conducting you before the judicial power of the country. No one has any right of persecution, intolerance, or exclusive legislation as to your religious opinions: no voice, save the grand peaceful voice of Humanity, has any right to interpose itself between God and your conscience.

God has given you the faculty of thought: no one has a right to suppress or restrain its expression, which is the act of communion between your soul and the souls of your brother men, and is our one sole means of progress.

The Press must be absolutely free. The rights of intellect are inviolable, and every *preventive* censorship is tyranny. Society may, however, punish the errors of the Press, or the teaching of crime or immorality, just as it may punish any other description of error. This right of punishment (decreed in virtue of a solemn public judgment) is a consequence of our human responsibility; but every anterior intervention is a negation of liberty.

The right of peaceful association is as sacred as thought itself. God gave us the tendency to association as a perennial means of progress, and as a pledge of that Unity which the human family is destined one day to attain.

No power, then, has a right to limit or impede association.

It is the duty of each of you to employ the life given him by God; to preserve it, and to develope it: each of you then is bound to labour, as the sole means of its material support. Labour is sacred. No one has a right to impede it, forbid it, or render it impossible by arbitrary regulations. No one has any right to forbid free trade in its productions. Your country is your lawful market, which no one may limit or restrain.

But when all these various forms of liberty shall be held sacred, when the State shall be constituted according to the universal will, and in such wise that each individual shall have every path towards the free development of his faculties thrown open before him,—forget not that high above each and every individual stands the intent and *Aim* which it is your duty to achieve; your own moral perfectibility, and that of others, through an ever more intimate and extended communion between all the members of the human family, so that the day may come when all shall recognise one sole Law.

"Your task is to found the Universal Family, to build up the City of God, and unremittingly to labour towards the active, progressive fulfilment of His great work in Humanity.

"When each of you, loving all men as brothers, shall reciprocally act like brothers; when each of you, seeking his own wellbeing in the wellbeing of all, shall identify his own life with the life of all, and his own interest with the interest of all; when each shall be ever ready to sacrifice himself for all the members of the Common Family, equally ready to sacrifice themselves for him; most of the evils which now weigh upon the human race

will disappear, as the gathering vapours of the horizon vanish on the rising of the sun; and the will of God will be fulfilled, for it is His will that love shall gradually unite the scattered members of Humanity and organize them into a single whole, so that Humanity may be one, even as He is One." *

Let not these words, the words of a man whose life and death were holy, and who loved the people and their future with an immense love, ever be forgotten by you, my brothers. Liberty is but a *means*. Woe unto you and to your future, should you ever accustom yourselves to regard it as the *end!* Your own individuality has its rights and duties, which may not be yielded up to any; but woe unto you and to your future, should the respect you owe unto that which constitutes your individual life, ever degenerate into the fatal crime of egotism.

Liberty is not the negation of all authority: it is the negation of every authority that fails to represent the Collective Aim of the nation, or that presumes to impose or maintain itself upon any other basis than that of your free consent.

In these later days the sacred idea of liberty has been perverted by sophistical doctrines. Some have reduced it to a narrow and immoral egotism; have made *self* everything, and have declared the aim of all social organization to be the satisfaction of its desires. Others have declared that all government and all authority are necessary evils, to be restricted and restrained as far as possible; that liberty has no limit, and that the aim of all society is that of indefinitely promoting liberty, which man has the right of using or abusing, provided his doing so result in no direct evil to others, and

* Lamennais, *Livre du Peuple*, iii.

that government has no other mission than that of preventing one individual from injuring another.

Reject these false doctrines, my brothers! The first has generated the egotism of class: the second makes of society—which, well organised, would be the representation of your collective life and aim—naught better than the soldier or police-officer commissioned to maintain an external and apparent peace.

The tendency of all such doctrines is to convert liberty into anarchy; to cancel the idea of collective moral improvement, and that mission of Progress which society ought to assume. If you should understand liberty thus, you would deserve to lose it, and sooner or later you would lose it.

Your liberty will be sacred so long as it shall be governed by and evolved beneath an idea of duty, of faith in the common perfectibility.

Your liberty will flourish, protected by God and man, so long as you hold it—not as the right to use or abuse your faculties in the direction it may please you to select—but as the right of free choice, according to your separate tendencies—of the means of doing good.

CHAPTER IX.

EDUCATION.

GOD has created you susceptible of Education. Therefore it is your duty to educate yourselves as far as lies in your power, and it is your right that the society to which you belong shall not impede your education, but assist you in it, and supply you with the means thereof when you have them not.

Your liberty, your rights, your emancipation from every injustice in your social position, the task which each of you is bound to fulfil on earth—all these depend upon the degree of education you are able to attain.

Without education you are incapable of rightly choosing between good and evil; you cannot acquire a true knowledge of your rights; you cannot attain that participation in political life without which your complete social emancipation is impossible; you cannot arrive at a correct definition and comprehension of your own mission.

Education is the bread of your soul. Without it your faculties lie dormant and unfruitful, even as the vital power lies sterile in the seed cast into untilled soil, and deprived of the benefits of irrigation and the watchful labour of the agriculturist.

At the present day your class is either uneducated, or receives its education at the hands of men or governments who, having no ruling principles to guide them, necessarily mutilate or misdirect it. Present directors of education imagine that they have fulfilled their duties towards you when they have opened a certain number of schools—distributed unequally over the territory they govern—wherein your children *may* receive a certain degree of elementary instruction, consisting principally of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Such teaching is properly called *instruction*, and it differs and is as distinct from true *education*, as the various organs of our existence differ and are distinct from our *life*. The organs of existence are not our life. They are the mere instruments of our life, and its means of manifestation; they neither govern nor direct it; they are equally the manifestation of the holiest or the most corrupt life; and just so does instruction provide the

means of putting in practice that which is taught by education, but it can never take the place of education.

Education addresses itself to the moral faculties; instruction to the intellectual. The first developes in man the knowledge of his duties; the second gives him the capacity of achieving them. Without instruction, education would be too often inefficient; without education, instruction is a lever deprived of its fulcrum.

You know how to read. What avails this knowledge if you are unfit to judge between the books containing error and those containing truth? You have learned to communicate your thoughts to your fellow-men in writing. What avails this knowledge, if your thoughts are the mere reflex of your own egotism?

Instruction, like wealth, is either a source of good or of evil, according to the manner and motive of its use. Consecrated to aid the progress of all, it is a means of civilisation and of liberty; turned to mere personal uses, it becomes an agent of tyranny and corruption.

In Europe at the present day, instruction, unaccompanied by a corresponding degree of moral education, is too often a serious evil; it assists in maintaining inequality between class and class of the same people, leads men to false doctrines, and produces a spirit of calculation, of egotism, and of compromise between the just and the unjust.

The distinction between those who offer you more or less of instruction and those who preach education, is more important than you are aware of, and deserves to be spoken of at some length.

The camp of the liberal party in Europe at the present day is split up into two Schools of doctrine.

The first of these schools proclaims the sovereignty of the Individual. The second declares that sovereignty

belongs to Society alone, and makes the manifest consent of the majority, its law.

The first imagines that it has fulfilled its mission when it has proclaimed the rights believed to be inherent in human nature, and preserved liberty. The second looks almost exclusively to *association*, and from the Social Pact that constitutes that association, it deduces the duties of each individual.

The first does not go beyond what I have termed instruction, for instruction does in fact tend to develope the individual faculties, without direction or rule. The second understands the necessity of education, and regards it as the manifestation of the Social programme.

The first inevitably tends to moral anarchy. The second, unmindful of liberty, runs the risk of upholding despotism—the despotism of the majority.

To the first of these schools belonged that generation of men known in France as the *Doctrinaires*, who betrayed the hopes of the people, after the revolution of 1830, and who, by proclaiming Liberty of Instruction, and nothing more, perpetuated the monopoly of Government in the hand of the *bourgeois* class, who did possess the means of developing their individual faculties. The second, unfortunately, is only represented at the present day by Powers or sects belonging to antiquated creeds or beliefs, and hostile to the Dogma of the future, which is Progress.

Both of these schools are defective. The tendency of both is narrow and exclusive.

The following is the truth:

All Sovereignty is in God, in the moral law, in the Providential design—which rules the world, and is from time to time revealed to Humanity, in different

epochs of its existence, by virtuous Genius—in the Aim we have to reach, in the Mission we have to fulfil.

Sovereignty cannot exist in the individual, nor in Society, except in so far as one or the other act in accordance with that design and law, and tend towards that aim.

The individual Ruler is either the best interpreter of that Law, and governs in its name, or he is a Usurper to be overthrown.

There is no legitimate sovereignty in the mere will of the majority, if it be contrary to the supreme moral law, or deliberately close the path of future progress.

The social weal, liberty, and progress: there can be no real sovereignty beyond these three terms.

Education teaches in what the social weal consists.

Instruction assures to the individual a free choice of the means of securing a continuous advance in the conception of the social weal.

That which is most important for you is, that your children be taught what are the ruling principles and beliefs directing the life of their fellowmen, during the span of existence allotted to them on earth; what the moral, social, and political programme of their nation; what the spirit of the legislation by which their actions will be judged; what the degree of progress already achieved by Humanity; what the goal it is destined to attain.

And it is important that they should be taught in their earliest years a spirit of equality and love, which links them in a common aim with the millions, the brothers given them by God.

The education that will afford your children such teaching as this, can only be given them by the nation.

At present their moral teaching is a mere anarchy.

Left exclusively to the parents, it is *null* in those cases where poverty and the necessity of constant material labour deprive them alike of the knowledge and time required to enable them to teach their children themselves, and of the means of providing other instructors. It is *evil* in those cases where egotism and corruption have perverted or contaminated the family.

Even where parents have the means of providing instruction for their children, they are too often brought up in materialism or superstition; in ideas of mere liberty or of passive resignation; of aristocracy or mere reaction against it, according to the character of the instructor—priestly or secular—whom the parents select. How can such education in childhood fit men to work together in harmony and fraternity towards a common aim, and to represent in their own persons the unity of the country?

Society calls upon them to promote the development of a common idea in which they have not been instructed. Society punishes them for the violation of laws of which they were left in ignorance, the scope and spirit of which society has never taught them. Society requires from them co-operation and sacrifice for an aim which no teachers have explained to them at the outset of their civil life.

Strange to say, the *Doctrinaire* School of which I have already spoken recognises the right of each separate individual to rule and teach the young, and does not admit the same right in the association of individuals, the nation. Their cry of liberty of instruction disinherits the nation of all moral direction. They proclaim the importance of unity in the monetary system, and the system of weights and measures; but that unity of *Principle*, upon which all national life should be founded and developed, is nothing to them.

Without a national education, the nation has no moral existence, for upon it alone can a national conscience be formed.

Without a national education—*common to all the citizens*—all equality of rights and duties is an unmeaning formula, for all knowledge of duties, and all capacity for the exercise of rights, are left to the chances of fortune, or the arbitrary choice of those who select the teacher.

The opponents of Unity of education invoke liberty in their support. The liberty of whom? Of the fathers, or of the children? In their system the moral liberty of the children is violated by the despotism of the father; the liberty of the young generation is sacrificed to the old; and liberty of progress is rendered an illusion.

Individual opinions and beliefs—false, it may be, and adverse to progress—are alone transmitted with all the authority of the father to the son, at an age when their examination is impossible. As they advance in life the position of the majority among you, and the necessity of occupying every hour in material employment, will prevent the mind already stamped and impressed with those opinions and beliefs, from modifying them by comparison with others.

In the name of this false liberty, the anarchical system I have described, tends to perpetuate that worst of despotisms, a moral *caste*.

This system, in fact, produces a form of despotism, not liberty. True liberty cannot exist without equality, and equality can only exist among those who start from a common ground, a common principle, and an uniform consciousness and knowledge of duty. Liberty can only rightly be exercised as a consequence of that knowledge.

I said, a few pages back, that true liberty is not the

right to choose evil, but the right of choice between the various paths that lead to good. The liberty invoked by these shallow philosophers is, in fact, an arbitrary right given to the father to choose the wrong for his child. What!—if a father should threaten to mutilate or in any way injure the *body* of his child, Society would interfere, called on and invoked by all; and shall the *soul* of that child be of less worth than the body? Shall not Society interfere to protect him from the mutilation of his faculties, from ignorance, from the perversion of his moral sense, from superstition?

The cry of Liberty of Instruction was of use in the day when it first arose, and it is useful even now in all countries where moral education is the monopoly of a despotic government, a retrograde caste, or a priesthood the nature of whose dogma renders it antagonistic to progress. That cry was a cry of emancipation, imperfect, but indispensable and necessary at the time.

But I speak to you of a time in which Religion shall inscribe the word Progress over the portal of the Temple; when all your institutions shall be so many repetitions of that word in various forms, and when a National education shall be given to the people which will conclude its teachings to its pupils with these words:—

To you, as beings destined to live under a common Pact with ourselves, we have now declared the fundamental basis of that Pact; the Principles in which your Nation believes at the present day; but remember that the first of these principles is Progress; remember that your mission, both as a man and a citizen, is to improve, as far as you may, the minds and hearts of your fellow-men. Go: examine and compare; and if you discover a truth superior to that which we believe

ourselves to possess, diffuse it freely, and the blessing of your country be with you.

Then, though not before, you may renounce the cry of liberty of instruction as inferior to your need, and fatal to the unity of the country; then you may ask—nay, exact—the foundation of a system of gratuitous National Education, *obligatory upon all.*

The nation is bound to transmit its programme to *every* citizen. Every citizen should receive *in the national schools* a moral education, a *course of nationality*—comprising a summary view of the progress of humanity and of the history of his own country; a popular exposition of the principles directing the legislation of that country, and the elementary instruction about which we are all agreed. Every citizen should be taught in these schools the lesson of equality and love.

The National Programme once transmitted to all the citizens, liberty resumes its rights. Not only family education, but every other, is sacred. Every man has an unlimited right to communicate his ideas to his fellow man; every man has a right to hear them. Society should encourage and promote the free utterance of thought in every shape, and open every path to the modification and development of the National Programme.

CHAPTER X.

ASSOCIATION—PROGRESS.

GOD has created you social and progressive beings. It is therefore your duty to associate yourselves, and to progress as far as the sphere of activity in which

circumstances have placed you, will permit. You have a right to demand that the society to which you belong shall in no way impede your work of association and progress, but, on the contrary, shall assist you, and furnish you with the means of association and progress of which you stand in need. Liberty gives you the power of choosing between good and evil; that is to say, between duty and egotism. Education will teach you to choose rightly. Association will give you the means of reducing your choice to action. Progress, the *Aim*, by which you must be guided in your choice, is, at the same time, when visibly achieved, the proof that your choice was not mistaken. Whenever any one of these conditions is neglected or betrayed, the man and the citizen either do not exist, or exist in a state of imperfection and impeded development.

You have therefore to strive to realize all these conditions, and above all, the right of association; without which both liberty and education are useless.

The right of association is as sacred as Religion itself, which is the association of souls. You are all the sons of God; you are therefore brothers. Who then may without guilt set limits to association, the communion among brothers?

This word *communion*, which I have written advisedly, was taught us by Christianity, which the men of the past declared to be an immutable religion, but which is, in fact, a step in the scale of the religious manifestations of Humanity.

And it is a sacred word. It taught mankind that they were a single family of equals before God, and united master and servant in a single thought of salvation, of love, and of hope in Heaven. It was an immense advance upon the preceding ages, when both

philosophers, and people believed the souls of citizens and the souls of slaves to be of different nature and race. And this mission alone would have sufficed to stamp the greatness of Christianity. The communion was the symbol of the equality and fraternity of souls, and it rested with Humanity to amplify and develope the truth hidden under that symbol.

The Church did not and could not do this. Timid and uncertain in the beginning, and allied with the nobles and the Temporal Powers in the sequel; imbued, from self-interest, with an aristocratic tendency which had no existence in the mind of its Founder,—the Church wandered out of the true path, and even receded so far as to diminish the moral value of the communion, by limiting it in the case of the laity to a communion in bread alone, and reserving solely to priests the communion in *both species*.

At that time arose a cry from all who felt within their souls the right of the whole human family to the symbols of unlimited communion, without distinction between the laity and ecclesiastics: *Communion in both species for the people; the Cup for the people!* In the fifteenth century that cry became the watchword of the aroused multitudes; it was the prelude to the Religious Reformation, and was sanctified by martyrdom. A holy man named John Huss, of Bohemia, who was the leader of that movement, perished in the flames kindled by the Inquisition.

At the present day most of you are ignorant of the history of those struggles, or believe them to have been the quarrels of fanatics about merely theological questions. But when a national education shall have popularised history, and taught you how every religious progress carries with it a corresponding progress in

civil life, you will appreciate those contests at their true worth, and honour the memory of those martyrs as of your benefactors. We owe it to those martyrs and their predecessors, that we have learned that there is no privileged class of interpreters between God and the people; that the best amongst us in wisdom and virtue may and ought to counsel and direct us on the path of improvement, but without any monopoly of power or supremacy; and that the right of communion is indeed equal for all men. That which is holy in heaven is holy on earth, and the communion of mankind in God, carries with it the association of mankind in their terrestrial life. The religious association of souls, carries with it the association of intellect and of action, which converts thought into reality.

Consider association, therefore, both your duty and your right.

There are those who seek to put a limit to the rights of the citizen by telling you that the true association is the state, the nation: that you ought all to be members of that association, but that every partial association amongst yourselves is either adverse to the state, or superfluous.

But the state, the nation, only represents the association of the citizens in those matters and in those tendencies which are common to *all* the men who compose it. There are tendencies and aims which do not embrace *all* the citizens, but only a certain number of them. And precisely as the tendencies and the aims which are common to all, constitute the nation; so the tendencies and aims which are common to a portion of the citizens, should constitute special associations.

Moreover—and this is the fundamental basis of the right of association—association is a guarantee for progress.

The state represents a certain sum or mass of *principles*, in which the universality of the citizens are agreed at the time of its foundation. Suppose that a new and true principle, a new and rational development of the truths that have given vitality to the state, should be discovered by a few among its citizens. How shall they diffuse the knowledge of this principle, except by association? Suppose that in consequence of scientific discovery, or of new means of communication opened up between peoples and peoples, or from any other cause, a new *interest* should arise among a certain number of the individuals composing the state, how shall they who first perceive this, make their way among the various interests of long standing, unless by uniting their efforts and their means?

Inertia, and a disposition to rest satisfied with the order of things long existing and sanctioned by the common consent, are habits too powerful over the minds of most men to allow a single individual to overcome them by his solitary word. The association of a daily increasing minority can do this. Association is the method of the future. Without it, the state would remain motionless, enchained to the degree of civilisation already reached.

Association should be progressive in the scope it endeavours to attain, and not contrary to those truths which have been conquered for ever by the universal consent of Humanity and of the nation.

An association founded for the purpose of facilitating theft of the property of others; an association obliging its members to polygamy; an association which should preach the dissolution of the nation or the establishment of despotism, would be illegal. The nation has the right of declaring to its members: *We cannot tolerate*

the diffusion among us of doctrines in violation of that which constitutes human nature, morality, or the country. Go forth, and establish amongst yourselves, beyond our frontiers, the associations which your tendencies suggest.

Association must be peaceful. It may not use other weapons than the apostolate of the spoken and written word. Its object must be to persuade, not to compel. Association must be public. Secret associations—which are a legitimate weapon of defence where there exists neither liberty nor nation—are illegal, and ought to be dissolved, wherever liberty and the inviolability of thought are rights recognised and protected by the country.

As the scope and intent of association is to open the paths of progress, it must be submitted to the examination and judgment of all.

And, finally, association is bound to respect in others those rights which spring from the essential characteristics of human nature. An association which, like the corporations of the middle ages, should violate the rights of labour, or which should tend directly to restrict liberty of conscience, ought to be repressed by the government of the nation.

With these exceptions, liberty of association among the citizens is as sacred and inviolable as that progress of which it is the life.

Every government which attempts to restrain them betrays its social mission, and it becomes the duty of the people first to admonish it, and—all peaceful means being exhausted—to overthrow it.

Such, my brothers, are the bases upon which your duties are founded, the sources from which spring your rights. An infinite number of questions will arise in the course of your civil life, which it is no part of the

present work, either to foresee, or to assist you in resolving. My sole aim in this book has been to present to you, even as torches to light you on your way, those *Principles* which should guide you through them all, and in the earnest application of which, you will find a method of resolving them for yourselves.

And this I believe I have done.

I have led you to God, as the source of duty and pledge of the equality of man: to the moral law, as the source of all civil laws and basis of your every judgment as to the conduct of those who frame those laws. I have pointed out to you the people—yourselves, ourselves, the universality of the citizens composing the nation—as the sole interpreter of the law, and the source of all political power. I have told you that the fundamental characteristic of the law is progress; progress indefinite and continuous from epoch to epoch; progress in every branch of human activity, in every manifestation of thought, from religion down to industry and to the distribution of wealth. I have described to you your *duties* towards Humanity, your country, your family, and yourselves. And I have deduced those duties from those essential characteristics which constitute the *human* creature, and which it is your task to develope.

These characteristics—inviolable in every man—are: liberty, susceptibility of education, the social tendency, and the capacity for and necessity of progress. And from these characteristics—without which there is neither true *man* nor true *citizen* possible—I have deduced, not your duties, but your rights; and the general character of the government you should seek for your country.

Never forget these *Principles*. Watch that they

never be violated. Incarnate them in yourselves. You will be free, and you will improve.

The task I have undertaken for you, would then be complete, were it not for a tremendous obstacle, arising in the bosom of society itself (as it is now constituted), to the possibility of your fulfilling your duties or exercising your rights.

This obstacle is the inequality of means.

In order to fulfil duties and to exercise rights,—time, intellectual development, and the certainty of material existence, are necessary.

Now, very many of you do not possess these first elements of progress. Their life is a constant and uncertain battle, in order to conquer the means of material existence. For them, the question is not one of *progress*, but of *life* itself.

There is then some deep and radical vice in the present organization of society. And my work would be rendered useless were I not to define that vice, and indicate a method of correcting it.

The economical question will therefore constitute the last portion of my work.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ECONOMICAL QUESTION.

MANY, too many, of you are poor. Life, for at least three-fourths of the working-class, whether labourers or mechanics, is a daily struggle to obtain the *indispensable* material means of existence. They are occupied in manual labour for ten, twelve, sometimes fourteen hours a-day, and by this constant, monotonous, and

painful industry, they scarcely gain the bare necessaries of physical existence. The attempt to teach such men the duty of progress, to speak to them of their intellectual and moral life, of their political rights, or of education, is sheer irony in the present state of things.

They have neither time nor means to improve and progress. Wearied, worn-out, half-stupefied by a life consumed in a round of petty and mechanical toil, all they do learn is a mute, impotent, and often unjust rancour against the class of men who employ them. They too often seek forgetfulness of the troubles of the day and the uncertainty of the morrow, in the stimulus of strong drink, and sink to rest in places better described as dens than rooms, to waken to a repetition of the same dull exercise of their merely physical powers.

It is a sad condition, and it must be altered.

You are *men*, and as such you possess faculties, not merely physical, but intellectual and moral: faculties which it is your duty to develope. You should be *citizens*, and, as such, exercise for the good of all, certain rights, which require a certain degree of education and a certain portion of time.

It is clear that you ought to labour less and gain more than you now do.

Sons of God, all of us, and brethren in Him and amongst ourselves, we are called to constitute one sole great Family.

In this family there may exist such inequality as is the result of diversity of aptitude, of capacity, or of disposition for labour, but it should be governed by one single principle; *Whosoever is willing to give—for the benefit of the whole—that amount of labour of which he is capable, ought to receive such amount of recompense for that labour, as will enable him more or less*

to develope his individual life in each of the essential characteristics by which individual life is defined.

This is the ideal which all of us ought to strive and study to approach more nearly from age to age.

Every change, every revolution which fails to advance us one step towards this ideal, which does not produce a moral and social progress corresponding to the political progress achieved, which does not result in one degree of improvement in the material condition of the poorer classes, violates the Providential design, and reduces itself to the rank of a mere war of faction against faction, each seeking illegitimate dominion, and each alike a falsehood and an evil.

But up to what point can we realize this aim at the present day? How and by what means can we reach this point?

Some of the more timid amongst your well-wishers have sought the remedy in the morality of the working-man himself. They have founded Savings-banks, and similar institutions, saying to the operative: *Bring your wages here; economise; abstain from every excess, whether of drink or otherwise; emancipate yourselves from poverty by privation.* And such advice is excellent, in so far as it tends to the moral improvement of the workman, without which all reforms are useless. But it neither solves the question of poverty itself, nor takes any account of social duty.

Very few of you *can* economise your wages. And all that those few can achieve by their slow accumulation is, the possibility of providing to a certain extent for their old age. Now, the economical question has more than this in view. Its object is also to provide for the years of manhood, to develope and expand *life*, as far as possible, while in its full vigour and activity, while it

may most efficaciously aid the progress of the Country and Humanity.

Even with regard to the mere material well-being of the working-class, this advice falls short of the aim, as it does not even hint at any method of increasing wealth or production. Moreover, society, which lives by the labour of the sons of the people, and demands from them their tribute of blood in the hour of danger, incurs a sacred debt towards them in return.

There are other men, not enemies of the people, but indifferent to the cry of suffering which bursts from the hearts of the sons of labour, and fearful of every great innovation, who belong to the school of Economists, and who have worthily and usefully fought the battle of industry and labour, but without reflecting that the necessity of progress and of association is an irradicable element of human nature.

This school has maintained, and still—like the philanthropists of whom I have spoken—does maintain, that every man *can*, even in the present state of things, build up his own independence on his own activity, that any change in the organization of labour would be either injurious or superfluous, and that the formula, *Each for himself and liberty for us all*, is sufficient to create, by degrees, an approximate equilibrium of ease and comfort among the various classes that constitute society.

Liberty of internal traffic, liberty of commerce among nations, a progressive reduction of custom-duties (especially upon raw materials), a general encouragement offered to great industrial enterprises, to the multiplication of means of communication, and of all machinery tending to increase activity of production—these, according to the *Economists*, are all that society can offer for the amelioration of the position of your class, and any further inter-

vention on its part would, in their opinion, be a source of evil.

If this were indeed true, the evil of poverty would be incurable; but God forbid, my brothers! that I should ever give your sufferings and your aspirations an answer so despairing, atheistic, and immoral. God has ordained for you a better future than that offered by the remedies of the Economists.

Their remedies, in fact, merely point to the possible and temporary increase of the production of wealth: they do not tend to its more equitable distribution. While the Philanthropists, regarding individual man alone, content themselves with the endeavour to make him more moral, without seeking to increase the common prosperity so as to give him an opportunity of progress; the Economists think only of increasing the sources of production, without occupying themselves with the condition of the individual man. Under the exclusive *régime* of liberty which they preach, and which has more or less regulated the economical world in these later days, the most irrefutable documentary evidence has shown an increase of productive activity and of capital, but not of universally diffused prosperity.

The misery of the working-classes is unchanged. Liberty of competition for him who possesses nothing—for him who, unable to save on his daily earnings, cannot even initiate a competition—is a lie; even as political liberty is a lie for those who, from want of education, instruction, time, and material means, are unable to exercise their rights.' Increased facilities for the exchange and conveyance of the products of labour would by degrees emancipate labour from the tyranny of trade and commerce, and from the existing classes of *intermediates* between the producer and the consumer,

but they cannot emancipate it from the tyranny of Capital; they cannot give the means of labour to him who has them not.

And from the want of an equal distribution of wealth, and of a just division of produce, combined with the progressive increase of the cypher of consumers, capital itself is turned aside from its true economic aim, and becomes in part stationary in the hands of a few, instead of spreading and circulating; or it is directed towards the production of objects of superfluity, luxury, and fictitious wants, instead of being concentrated on the production of objects of primary necessity to life, and is risked in perilous and, too often, immoral speculations.

At the present day—and this is the curse of our actual social economy—capital is the tyrant of labour. Society is at present composed—economically speaking—of three classes; that is to say, of *capitalists*, being the possessors of the means and implements of labour, of land, of factories, ready money, and raw material; of *middlemen*, chiefs and organizers of labour, and dealers, who are, or ought to be, the representatives of the intellectual side; and of *operatives*, who represent the material side of labour.

The first of these three classes is sole master of the field, and is in a position to promote, accelerate, delay, or direct labour toward certain special aims, at will. And the share of this class of the results of labour and the value of production is comparatively settled and defined, the location of the instruments of labour is variable only within certain known and definite limits, and even time itself may be said to be to some extent in their power, as they are removed from the pressure of immediate want.

The share of the second class is uncertain. It

depends upon their intellect, their activity, and above all, on circumstances, such as the greater or less development of competition and the flux and reflux of capital, which is regulated by events not within the reach of their calculations.

The workman's share consists simply of his wages, determined previously to the execution of the work, and without regard to the greater or less profits of the undertaking; and the limits within which those wages vary, are determined by the relation that exists between the supply and demand, or, in other words, between the population of operatives and capital.

Now, as the first constantly tends to increase, and to an increase generally superior (however slightly) to the increase of the second, the tendency of wages, where no other causes intervene, is of course to decrease.

Time also is altogether beyond the power of the working-man. Financial and political crises, the sudden application of new machinery to the different branches of industrial activity, the irregularities of production, and its frequent excess and accumulation in a given direction (an evil inseparable from partially-enlightened competition), the unequal distribution of the working-classes upon certain points, or in certain branches of activity, and a hundred other causes tending to the interruption of labour, take from the operative all free choice as to his own condition. On the one side he sees absolute starvation, on the other the necessity of accepting whatever terms are offered to him.

Such a state of things, I repeat, indicates the germ of a moral evil which must be cured.

The remedies proposed both by the philanthropists and economists are unequal to this task.

And nevertheless there is progress in the class to

which you belong; a progress historical and continuous, and which has overcome still greater difficulties.

You were first *slaves*, then *serfs*. Now you are *hirelings*. You have emancipated yourselves from slavery and from serfdom. Why should you not emancipate yourselves from the yoke of *hire*, and become free producers, and masters of the totality of production which you create?

Wherefore should you not accomplish, through your own peaceful endeavours and the assistance of a society having sacred duties towards each of its members, the most beautiful Revolution that can be conceived—a revolution which, accepting labour as the commercial basis of human intercourse, and the fruits of labour as the basis of property, should gradually abolish the class distinctions, and tyrannical dominion of one element of labour over another, and by proclaiming one sole law of just equilibrium between production and consumption, harmonise and unite all the children of the country, the common mother?

Owing principally to the teachings of the republican party, the sense of a social duty towards the sons of labour—the earnest of a better future for the peoples—had gradually been awakened in Europe during the last thirty years, when certain schools arose (in France especially), composed for the most part of well-meaning and sincere friends of the people, but led astray by an overweening love of system-making, and by individual vanity.

These schools introduced certain exclusive and exaggerated doctrines under the name of *Socialism*—doctrines frequently antagonistic to the wealth already acquired by other classes, as well as economically impossible. By terrifying the multitude of smaller

shopkeepers, and creating a sense of distrust between the different classes of citizens, they caused the social question to recede, and split up the republican party into two separate camps.

I cannot now pause to examine these different schools one by one. They were called *Saint Simonianism, Fourierism, Communism,* etc., etc. Nearly all of them were based upon ideas good in themselves, and long accepted by all who belonged to the creed of Progress, but they spoiled or nullified these ideas by the erroneous and tyrannical methods by which they proposed to apply and reduce them to practice. And it is necessary that I should briefly point out to you wherein their errors consisted, because the promises held out to the people by these systems are so magnificent as to be likely to seduce your approval, and you would run the risk, by accepting them, of retarding your emancipation, which is inevitable in a not far distant future.

It is true—and this fact alone should awaken a strong sense of doubt in your minds—that when circumstances had placed some of the authors of these systems in power, they never even attempted to realize their own doctrines in practice. Giants on paper, they dwindled and shrank before the difficulties of the practical reality.

If, at some future day, you examine these various systems with attention; bearing in mind the fundamental ideas I have hitherto pointed out to you, and the indestructible characteristics of *Human* nature, you will find that they all of them violate some of these characteristics, as well as the law of progress, and the method of its accomplishment through Humanity.

Progress is accomplished through laws which no human power can break. It is accomplished step by

step, by the perpetual *development* and *modification* of the elements which manifest the activity of life.

In certain epochs, in certain countries, and under the influence of certain errors or prejudices, men have frequently given the name of essential *elements* and characteristics of social life, to things which have no root in nature, but only in the conventional customs of an erring society—customs which disappeared at the expiration of those epochs, or beyond the limits of those countries.

But you may discern what are the true elements inseparable from our human nature, first by interrogating —as I suggested elsewhere—the instincts of your own souls, and then by testing and verifying these by the tradition of all the ages, and of every country, in order to judge whether those instincts are such as have ever been the instincts of Humanity. And those things which the innate voice within yourselves and the grand voice of Humanity alike declare to be essential elements constitutive of life itself, have to be modified and developed from epoch to epoch, but can never be abolished.

Among the essential elements of human life—such as Religion, Association, Liberty, and others to which I have alluded in the course of this work—Property is one.

The first principle and origin of property is in human nature itself. It represents the necessities of the material life of the individual, which it is his duty to maintain. Even as the individual is bound to transform the moral and intellectual world, through the medium of religion, science, and liberty, so he is bound to transform, ameliorate, and govern the physical world, through the medium of material labour. And property is the

sign and representative of the fulfilment of that task, of the amount of labour by which the individual has transformed, developed, and increased the productive forces of nature.

The *Principle* of property is therefore eternal, and you will find it recognised and protected throughout the whole existence of Humanity. But the *modes* by which it is governed are mutable, and destined—like every other manifestation of life—to undergo the law of progress. They who, finding property once constituted and established in a certain manner, declare that manner to be inviolable, and struggle against every effort to transform it, thus deny progress itself.

It is enough to take up two volumes of history, treating of two different epochs, to find an alteration in the constitution of property. And they who, because at a given epoch they happened to find property ill-constituted, declare that it must be abolished, and seek to cancel it from society, deny one of the elements of human nature, and would—were it possible they should succeed—retard progress by mutilating life. Property, however, would inevitably reappear shortly after, and probably in the identical shape it wore at the period of its abolition.

Property is ill-constituted at the present day, because the source and origin of its actual division was, generally speaking, in conquest; in the violence by which, at a period remote from our own day, certain invading peoples or classes took possession either of land or of the fruits of labour not their own. Property is ill-constituted at the present day, because the bases of the partition of the fruits of a labour achieved by both proprietor and workman are not laid down in a just and equal proportion to the labour done. Property is ill-consti-

tuted, because, while it confers on its possessor political and legislative rights which are denied to the workman, it tends to become the monopoly of the few, inaccessible to the many. Property is ill-constituted, because the system of taxation is ill-constituted, and tends to maintain the privilege of wealth in the hands of the proprietor, while it oppresses the poorer classes, and renders saving impossible to them.

But if, instead of correcting the errors, and slowly modifying the constitution of property, you should seek to abolish it, you would suppress a source of wealth, of emulation, and of activity, and would resemble the savage who cut down the tree in order to gather its fruit.

We must not seek to abolish property because at present it is the possession of the few: we must open up the paths by which the many may acquire it. We must go back to the principle which is its legitimization, and endeavour that it shall in future be the result of labour alone. We must lead Society towards establishing a more equable basis of remuneration between the proprietor or capitalist and the workman. We must transform the system of taxation so as to exempt the first necessaries of life therefrom, and thus render that economy which gradually produces property, possible to working-men. And in order that these things may be, we must suppress the political privilege now conceded to property, and allow to all a share in the work of legislation.

Now all these things are both just and possible. By educating yourselves, and organizing yourselves earnestly to demand them and determine to have them, you may obtain them; whereas, by seeking the abolition of property, you would seek an impossibility, do an injustice

to those who have already acquired it through the own labour, and diminish instead of increasing production.

Nevertheless, the abolition of individual property is the remedy proposed by many of the Socialist systems of which I have spoken to you, and above all by Communism.

Others have gone even further, and, observing that the Religious idea, the idea of government, and the idea of country, are disfigured and falsified by religious error, by class privilege, and dynastic egotism, they demand the abolition of all religion, of all government, and even of Nationality. This is the conduct of children or barbarians. Might they not with as much reason declare that, disease being frequently generated by the corruption of the atmosphere, they demand the suppression of every respiratory gas?

But the teachings of those who seek to found anarchy in the name of liberty, and cancel society for the sake of the rights of the individual, require no further confutation from me to you. The whole of my work is directed against the guilty dream; which is the negation of progress, of duty, of human fraternity, of the solidarity of nations, and of all those things which you and I hold in veneration.

Those who, confining themselves within the limits of the economical question, demand the abolition of individual property, and the organization of communism, fall into another extreme—the negation of the individual and of liberty—which would close the path to progress, and (so to speak) petrify Society.

The following is the general formula of Communism:

The property of every element of production, such as land, capital—movable or immovable—instruments of

labour, &c., to be concentrated in the state. The state to assign to each man his portion of labour, and his portion of retribution, some say with absolute equality, others say according to his wants.

Such a mode of existence, were it possible, would be the existence of the beaver, not the life of a man.

Liberty, dignity, and individual conscience, would all disappear before this organization of productive machines. The satisfaction of the wants of physical life may be possible by such means, but intellectual and moral life would be entirely cancelled, and with it all emulation, all free choice of labour, all liberty of association, all the joys of property, and—in short—all that stimulates and urges man to production. The human family, under such a system, becomes a mere human flock or herd, and all that is necessary for it is a wide pasture-ground.

Which of you could reconcile himself to such a programme? Equality is thus realized, say they. What equality? Equality in the distribution of labour? That is impossible. Labour is in its nature various, and cannot be fairly calculated either by its duration or by the amount achieved in a given time; but rather by its difficulty, by the more or less agreeable nature of the work done, the amount of human vitality it consumes, and its utility to society.

How can the equality or difference between an hour's labour passed in a mine, or in purifying the stagnant waters of a marsh, and an hour's labour spent in a spinning-factory, be estimated? The impossibility of making such calculations fairly has, in fact, suggested to some of the founders of these systems the idea of compelling every man to perform in his turn a certain amount of labour in every branch of useful activity: an absurd remedy, which would render perfection of produc-

tion impossible, while it would be impotent to equalise the weak with the strong, the intellectually clever with the slow, the man of nervous temperament with the man of lymphatic tendency, &c. The labour which is easy and welcome to the one becomes irksome and difficult to the other.

Would it produce equality in the division of the products of labour?

This also is impossible. Either the equality must be absolute—and this would result in great injustice, as there would be no distinction remaining between the different wants arising from organization, nor between the power and capacity created by a sense of duty, and the power and capacity given, without merit or desert, by nature—or the equality must be relative, and calculated according to diversity of wants, and then, by taking no account of individual production, it would violate those rights of property which ought to be the reward of the workman's labour.

Moreover, who should be the Arbitrator, and decide upon the just wants of each individual? Should this Arbitrator be the State?

Working-men! brothers! are you disposed to accept a hierarchy of head-masters of the common property?—masters of the mind through the superiority given by an exclusive education, masters of the body from their power of determining the work you have to do, your capacity to do it, and your wants when it is done? Is not this a return to bygone slavery? Would not these masters, beguiled by that theory of *interests* of which they were the representatives, and seduced by the immense power concentrated in their hands, become again the founders of the hereditary dictatorship of bygone castes?

No. Communism would not realize equality among the sons of labour; it would not tend to increase production—which is the great need at the present day—because it is in the nature of most men, when once the means of existence are secured to them, to rest satisfied; and the amount of incentive remaining to increase production, diffused over all the members of society, would be so small as not to have the power of rousing and exciting men's faculties. The *quality* of production would not be improved, as no encouragement would be offered to progress in invention, which could never be wisely furthered by an uncertain and unintelligent *collective* direction and organization.*

The only remedy Communism has to offer for all the thousand ills that afflict the sons of the people, is *security against hunger.*

Now, are there no other means of achieving this?

Cannot the workman's right to life and labour be secured without overturning the whole social organism, without rendering production sterile, and without impeding progress by cancelling individual liberty to enchain it thus in a tyrannical, military organization?

The remedy for your sufferings cannot be found in any arbitrary general organization built up in a day by one or the other individual mind; opposed to the universally-received bases of civilisation and suddenly imposed by decree. We are not here to *create* Humanity, but to *continue* it. We may, we ought to modify the organization of its constituent elements, but we cannot suppress or destroy them. Humanity rebels,

* It has been calculated that if one workman among a hundred thousand should produce the value of a hundred francs over the mean production of the community, he would gain as his own share the thousandth part of a franc, or three cents every thirty years. Can this be regarded as a stimulus to production?

and ever will rebel, against the attempt. The time spent in an endeavour to realize these illusions would therefore be time lost.

The remedy is not to be found in any increase of wages imposed by governmental authority, and unaccompanied by other changes tending to increase capital. An increased rate of wages—that is to say, an increase of the *cost* of production—would carry with it an increase in the price of produce, a consequent diminution of consumption, and hence of work for the producers.

The remedy is not to be found in any theory tending to cancel individual liberty, which is the consecration of, and stimulus to, labour, nor in anything tending to diminish capital, which is the source and the instrument of labour and production.

The remedy is to be found in *the union of labour and capital in the same hands.*

When society shall recognise no other distinction save the distinction between *producers* and *consumers;* or rather when every man shall be alike producer and consumer; when the profits of labour, instead of being parcelled out among that series of *intermediates*—which (beginning with the capitalist and ending with the retailer) frequently increases the price of production fifty per cent,—shall belong entirely to those who perform the labour, all the *permanent* causes of your poverty will be removed.

Your future depends upon your emancipation from the exactions of capital, which is at present the arbitrary ruler of a production in which it has no share.

Your *material* and *moral* future. Look around you. Wherever you find capital and labour in the same hands—wherever the profits of labour are divided

among the workmen in proportion to the increase of those profits and to the amount of aid given by the workmen to the collective work—you will find both a decrease of poverty and an increase of morality.

In the canton of Zurig, in the Engadina, and many other parts of Switzerland, where the peasant is a proprietor, and land, capital, and labour are united in the hands of a single individual; in Norway, Flanders, and Eastern Friesland; in Holstein, in the German Palatinate, in Belgium, and in the island of Guernsey on the English coast, there is visible a prosperity comparatively superior to all the other parts of Europe, where the cultivators are not the proprietors of the soil.

These countries are peopled by a race of agriculturists remarkable for their honesty, dignity, independence, and frank and open bearing.

The mining population of Cornwall in England, and those American navigators who trade as whalers between China and America, amongst whom this participation in the profits of their labour obtains, are recognised and admitted by official documents to be superior to the workmen who are remunerated by a predetermined rate of wages.

Association of labour, and the division of the fruits of labour, or rather of the profits of the sale of its productions between the producers, in proportion to the amount and value of the work done by each—this is the social future.

You were once slaves, then serfs, then hirelings. You have but to *will* it, in order shortly to become free producers, and brothers, through Association. Association—but free, voluntary, and organized on certain bases, by yourselves, among men who know, esteem, and love each other; not imposed by the force of govern-

mental authority, and without respect to individual ties and affections, upon men regarded rather as cyphers and machines of production, than as beings moved by spontaneous impulse and free will.

Association—but to be administered with a truly republican fraternity by your own delegates, and from which you should be free to withdraw at your own discretion; not subject to the despotism of the State, or of an arbitrarily-constituted Hierarchy, ignorant of your individual wants and position.

An Association of *nuclei*—groups—to be formed according to your own tendencies, and not, (as the authors of the systems of which I have spoken teach) of *all* the members of a given branch of industrial or agricultural activity.

The concentration of *all* the members of the State, or even of all the citizens of a single city, following a given trade, in one *sole* productive society, would lead us back to the bygone tyrannical monopoly of the Corporations. It would make of the producer the arbitrary judge of prices, to the injury of the consumer; legalize the oppression of the minority, shut out the workman who might be unsatisfied or discontented with its regulations, from all possibility of finding work; and suppress the necessity of progress, by extinguishing all rivalry in work, and all stimulus to invention.

Within the last twenty years Association has occasionally been timidly attempted in France, in Belgium, and in England, and it has been crowned with success wherever it was commenced with energy, resolution, and a spirit of self-sacrifice.*

* See, on this subject, *Self-help by the People*, and *The History of Co-operation in Halifax*, written by G. J. Holyoake (London Book Store, 282 Strand), valuable and encouraging little books which should be in the hands of all working people.—*Translator's Note.*

In Association is the germ of an entire social transformation, a transformation which, by emancipating you from the servitude of *wages*, will gradually further and increase produce, and improve the economical position of the country.

The tendency of the present system is to make the capitalist seek to increase his gains in order to withdraw from the arena; while the tendency of association would be to secure the continuance of labour—that is to say, of production.

At present the master, the director of the work done, who generally owes his position to no special aptitude, but to mere possession of capital, is liable to be improvident, rashly speculative, or incompetent; an association, directed by chosen delegates, and watched over by all its members, would not run the risk of suffering from such errors or defects.

Under the present system, labour is too often directed to the production of superfluities rather than necessaries, and owing to a capricious and unjust inequality of pay, workmen in one branch of activity abound, while they are wanting in another branch. The workman, limited to a determinate recompense, has no motive to spend all the zeal and energy of which he is capable upon his work, in order to multiply and improve its produce.

Evidently Association would offer a remedy to this and many other causes both of interruption and inferiority of production.

Liberty of withdrawal for individual members, without injury to the *Association*—equality of all the members in the choice of an elective administration, with powers either renewable at a given period, or, better, subject to revocation—freedom of admission posterior to the foundation of the Association, without the obligation of intro-

ducing new capital, but with permission to supply its place by an annual contribution to the treasury of the Association, to be deducted from the profits of the first years of union—*indivisibility and perpetuity of the collective capital*—such an amount of retribution as secures the necessities of life equally to all—free distribution of the tools or instruments of labour to all according to the quantity and quality of the work done; —such are the general bases upon which you must found your associations, if you are willing to achieve a work of present self-sacrifice for the benefit of the class to which you belong.

Each of these bases, and above all that concerning the perpetuity of the *Collective* capital, which is the pledge of your own emancipation and your link with future generations, would require a chapter to itself. But a special study of the question of working-men's associations does not enter into the plan of my present work. Perhaps, should God grant me some few more years of life, I may make of this study a separate labour of love for you. In the meantime, rest assured that the rules I have just sketched for you are the result of deep reflection and earnest study, and deserve your attentive consideration.

But the Capital? The capital by which association is to be initiated in the first instance; whence to obtain this?

It is a grave question, and I cannot treat it at such length as I should wish. But I may briefly point out your own duty and that of others.

The first source of that capital is in yourselves, in your own economy, your own spirit of self-sacrifice. I know the position of too many of you, but there are some of you who—either owing to a continuance of work or its better

retribution—are in a position to economise for this aim. Some eighteen or twenty of these might thus collect the trifling sum necessary to enable you to commence work on your own account. And the consciousness of fulfilling a solemn duty, and thus *deserving* your emancipation, ought to give you strength to do this.

I might quote for you many Industrial Associations, now well established and flourishing, which were begun by a few workmen with their savings of a penny a day. I might relate to you many stories of sacrifices heroically endured in France,* and elsewhere, by the first few

* In 1848 the delegates of some hundreds of workmen who had united together with the idea of establishing a pianoforte manufactory upon the Associative principle, finding that a large capital was necessary for their undertaking, applied to the Government for a loan of 300,000 francs. The application was refused. The association was dissolved, but 14 workmen determined to overcome every obstacle, and reconstitute it out of their own resources. They had neither money nor credit: they had faith.

They initiated their Society with a capital consisting of tools and instruments of labour of the value of about 2000 francs. But a floating capital was indispensable.

Each of these workmen contrived, not without great difficulty, to contribute 10 francs, and other workmen, not belonging to their society, added some little offerings to swell their capital. On the 10th March 1849, having collected the sum of 229 francs 50 cents, the Association was declared to be founded.

But their little social fund was insufficient for the cost of starting, and the small daily incidental expenses of their establishment. Nothing remained for wages, and two months passed without the members of the Association receiving a single cent in remuneration for their labour. How did they subsist during this time of crisis? As working-men do subsist in periods when they are without work, through help given by their comrades, and by selling or pawning their goods.

Some orders, however, had been executed, and these were paid for on the 4th May 1849. That day was to the Association what the first victory is in war, and they determined to celebrate it. Having paid all urgent debts, each associate received a sum of 6 francs 61 cents. It was agreed that each should keep 5 francs, and that the remainder should be spent in a fraternal banquet. The 14 members, most of whom had not tasted wine for more than a year, sat down to a common dinner with their families. The cost was 32 sous

workmen who commenced such enterprises, and are now in the possession of considerable capital. There is indeed scarcely any difficulty which may not be overcome by strong will, when sustained by the consciousness of doing good. Almost all of you may contribute some trifling aid to the primary little fund, either in money, raw material, or implement of labour.

By a consistent course of conduct and habits of life

a-family. For another month their wages only reached 5 francs a-week. In June, however, a baker, either a lover of music or a speculator, proposed to buy a pianoforte from them, and pay for it in bread. The offer was accepted, and the price agreed upon was 480 francs. This was a piece of good fortune for the Association, which was thus secure of the first necessary of life. The price of the bread was not considered in the wages of the members. Each man received the amount necessary for his own consumption, and the married men enough for their families.

By degrees, the Association, the members of which were very clever workmen, surmounted the obstacles and privations of the first period of its existence. Their books gave excellent testimony to their progress. In the month of August the weekly earnings of each member rose from 10 to 15 and 20 francs; nor did this represent the whole of their profits, for each member paid into the common fund a weekly contribution larger than the sum he withdrew as wages for his own use.

On the 30th December 1850, the books of the Association revealed the following encouraging facts:—

The members, at that date, amounted to 32.

The establishment was paying 2000 francs per annum for rent, and their premises were already too small for their business.

The value of the tools, &c., belonging to the Society was 5922 francs 66 cents.

The value of their goods and raw material amounted to 22,972 francs 28 cents.

The cash-box of the Society contained bills for 3540 francs. Open credits, almost all good, amounted to 5861 francs 99 cents.

Their stock, therefore, amounted to 39,317 francs 88 cents.

The Society only owed 4737 francs 80 cents of ordinary business debts, and 1650 francs to 80 well-wishers to the Association among working-men in the same trade, for small loans advanced to the Association at its commencement.

The nett balance in favour of the Society was therefore 32,930·02 francs.

Since then the Association has never ceased to flourish.

calculated to win the esteem of your companions or relations, you may induce them to advance small loans, in consideration of which they might become shareholders, and receive the interest of their money from the profits of the enterprise.

In many branches of industry in which the price of tools or of raw material is trifling, the capital required for commencing work on your own account is small, and you may collect or save it among yourselves if you resolutely *determine* to do so. And it will be in every respect better for you that the capital be *all* your own, acquired with the sweat of your own brows, and of the credit you have gained by conscientious work.

Even as those Nations who have achieved their liberty by shedding their own blood, are those who best know how to preserve it, so your associations will derive a better and more durable profit from the capital acquired through your own labour, watchfulness, and economy, than from that obtained from any other source. This is the nature of things. The Workingmen's Associations which were founded with governmental aid in Paris in 1848, prospered far less than those whose first capital was the fruit of the men's own sacrifices.

But although I—loving you too earnestly for servile adulation—thus admonish you of the points of weakness which either exist or may arise among you, and exhort you to self-sacrifice, this in no way diminishes the duties of others towards you.

Those to whom circumstances have granted wealth ought to understand this. They ought to understand that the emancipation of your class is a part of the Providential design, and that it will be accomplished whether with them or against them. Many of them do

understand it, and amongst these, if you give them proofs of an earnest and determined will, and of an honest intelligence, you will find help in your undertakings. They can—and if they are once convinced that your endeavour after Association is not the desire of a day, but the *faith* of a majority among you—they will smooth your path towards obtaining credit either by advances of money, by establishing banks giving credit to collective bodies of workmen for work to be done, or possibly by admitting you to a share in the profits of their establishments, as an intermediate step between the past and future, which might probably enable you to put together the small amount of capital necessary for the formation of an independent Association.

In Belgium, banks, called *Banks of Anticipation*, or *Banks of the People*, already exist, offering such facilities as I have described. In Scotland also, I believe, there are many banks willing to give credit to any man of known probity, ready to pledge his own honour and able to offer the security of one other individual of equally good character. And the plan of admitting the workmen to a participation in the profits of the business has already been adopted by several employers with remarkable success.*

CHAPTER XII.

CONCLUSION.

BUT the State, the Government—an institution only legitimate when based upon a mission of Education and

* *In Paris, for instance, the house-painting establishment of M. Leclaire* is founded upon this principle, and is well-known for its prosperous condition.

Progress not yet understood—the State has a solemn duty towards you, a duty which will be easy of fulfilment when we have a really National Government, the Government of a free and united people.

A vast series of means of help might be bestowed by the Government upon the people, by which the social problem might be solved without spoliation, violent measures, or interference with the wealth *previously acquired* by any of its citizens, and without exciting that immoral and unjust antagonism between class and class, fatal to the national welfare, which visibly retards the progress of France at the present day.

The following would be important and powerful modes of assistance :—

The exercise of a moral influence in favour of Working-men's Associations by the publicly-manifested approval of the Government agents, by a frequent discussion of their fundamentary principles in the House of Representatives, and by legalizing all the voluntary associations constituted on the basis indicated above.

Improved methods of communication, and abolition of the obstacles now impeding the free conveyance of produce.

The establishment of public magazines and depôts in which the approximate value of the goods or merchandise consigned having been ascertained, the Associations should receive a document or receipt negotiable in the manner of a bank-bill, by which means the Associations would be enabled to carry on their affairs without the ruinous necessity of an immediate sale without regard to prices.

The concession of the execution of necessary public works to Working-men's Associations upon equal terms to those granted to individual speculation.

Simplification of judicial forms, justice being at present ruinously costly, and too often inaccessible to the poor.

Legal facilities given to the sale and transfer of landed property.

A radical transformation of the system of taxation, by the substitution of one sole tax upon income, to the present complex and expensive system of direct and indirect taxation. This would give public and practical sanction to the principle of the *sacredness of human life*, for as neither labour, progress, nor the fulfilment of duty are possible without life, a given amount of money, the amount judged *necessary* to the maintenance of *life*, should be exempt from all taxation.

But there are further means :—

The secularisation or appropriation of ecclesiastical property by the State—a thing not at present to be thought of, yet nevertheless inevitable in the future, when the State shall assume its true educational mission —will place a vast sum of wealth in the hands of the nation. To this may be added the value of hitherto unreclaimed land, and the profits of railways and other public enterprises, the administration of which should be in the hands of the State; the value of the landed property belonging to the communes,* the value of property now descending by *collateral* succession beyond the fourth degree, and which should revert to the State, and many other sources of wealth which it is unnecessary here to enumerate.

* This property belongs *legally* to the communes, *morally* to the poor of the communes. I do not mean that such property should be taken from the communes, but that it should be consecrated to the poor of each commune, and thus constituted, under the supervision of elective communal councils, the inalienable *Capital* of *Agricultural Associations.*

Suppose all this mass of wealth and resources accumulated in the formation of a NATIONAL FUND, to be consecrated to the intellectual and economic progress of the whole country. Why should not a considerable portion of such a fund be employed (proper provision being made to guard against its wasteful use or dissipation) as a *Fund of Credit*, bearing interest at one and a half or two per cent., to be distributed to the Voluntary Working-class Associations, constituted according to the bases indicated above, and giving evidence of *morality* and *capacity*. This sum of capital to be held sacred, not merely to the promotion of labour in the present generation, but in futurity; its operations being upon so vast a scale as to ensure compensation for the occasional, inevitable losses it would have to sustain.

The distribution of the Fund of Credit ought not to be in the hands either of the Government or of a National Central Bank, but of *local* Banks, administered by elective Municipal Councils, under the supervision of the Central Government.

Without subtracting anything from the actual wealth of any existing class, and without enriching any single class through the medium of that taxation, which, being contributed by *all* citizens, should be employed for the advantage and benefit of all; such a series of measures as are here suggested, by diffusing credit, increasing and improving production, compelling a diminution of the rate of interest, and intrusting the progress and continuity of labour to the zeal and interest of the producers, would replace the limited and ill-directed sum of wealth at present concentrated in a few hands, by a wealthy nation, directress of its own production and consumption.

Such, Italian Workmen, is your future. You may

hasten this future. Conquer for yourselves your country, and a truly popular Government, the representative of our collective life and mission. Organize yourselves in a vast league of the people, so that your voice be the voice of the million, not merely of a few individuals. Truth and justice will be on your side, and the nation will listen to you.

But, be warned! and believe the words of a man who has been earnestly studying the course of events in Europe during the last thirty years, and who has seen the holiest enterprises fail in the hour of promised success, through the errors or immorality of their supporters. You will never succeed unless through *your own improvement.* You can only obtain the exercise of your rights by deserving them, through your own activity, and your own spirit of love and sacrifice. If you seek your rights in the name of *duties* fulfilled or to fulfil, you will obtain them. If you seek them in the name of egotism, or any theory of happiness and well-being propounded by the teachers of materialism, you will never achieve other than a momentary triumph, to be followed by utter delusion.

They who appeal to you in the name of well-being and happiness, will deceive and betray you. They seek also their own well-being and happiness, and merely desire to unite with you as an element of strength wherewith to overcome the obstacles in their own path. When once they have obtained their own rights through your help, they will abandon the effort to obtain yours in order to enjoy their own.

Such is the history of the last half-century, and the name of this last half-century is, *Materialism.*

Sad story of blood and sorrow! I have seen them in my own land—these men who denied God, religion,

virtue, duty, and sacrifice, and spoke only in the name of the *right to happiness* and *enjoyment*—I have seen them advance boldly to the struggle with the words *people* and *liberty* on their lips, and unite with us men of a better faith, who imprudently admitted them in our ranks. As soon as a first victory, or the opportunity of some cowardly compromise, opened the path of enjoyment to them, they forsook the cause of the people, and became our bitterest enemies the day after. A few years of danger and persecution were sufficient to weary and discourage them.

And wherefore should they, men without any conscientious belief in a Law of Duty, without faith in a mission imposed upon man by a Supreme Power, have persisted in sacrifice even to the last years of life?

And I have seen, with deep sadness, the sons of the people, educated in materialism by those men, turn false to their mission and their future, false to their country and themselves, betrayed by some foolish, immoral hope of obtaining material happiness, through furthering the caprice or interest of a despotism.

I have seen the working-men of France stand by, indifferent spectators of the *coup d'etât* of the 2d December, because all the great social questions had dwindled in their minds into a question of material prosperity; and they foolishly believed that the promises, artfully made to them by him who had destroyed the liberty of their country, would be kept.

Now they mourn over their lost liberty, without having acquired even the promised material well-being.

No: without God, without the sense of a moral law, without morality, without a spirit of sacrifice, and by merely following after men who have neither faith, nor reverence for truth, nor holiness of life, nor aught to

guide them but the vanity of their own systems—I repeat it, with deep conviction—you will never succeed. You may achieve *émeutes*, but you will never realize the true Great Revolution you and I alike desire—a revolution, not the offspring and illusion of irritated egotism, but of religious conviction.

Your own improvement and that of others; this must be the supreme hope and aim of every social transformation.

You cannot change the fate of man by merely embellishing his material dwelling. You will never induce the society to which you belong to substitute a system of Association for a system of salary and wages, unless you convince them that your association will result in improved production and collective prosperity. And you can only prove this by showing yourselves capable of founding and maintaining association through your own honesty, mutual good-will, love of labour, and capacity of self-sacrifice.

In order to progress, you must show yourselves capable of progress.

Tradition, Progress, Association. These three things are sacred. Twenty years ago I wrote :—

"I believe in the grand voice of God which the Ages transmit to us throughout the universal tradition of Humanity, and it teaches me that the Family, the Nation, and Humanity, are the three spheres in which the human individual is destined to labour for the common good, towards the moral perfection of himself and others, or rather of himself through others.

"It teaches me that property is destined to be the manifestation of the material activity of the individual, of his share in the transformation of the physical world ; as the franchise is the manifestation of his share in the administration of the political world.

"It teaches me that the merit or demerit of the individual, before God and man, depends upon his use of these rights; and it teaches me that all these things, being elements of human nature, are perennially modified and transformed as they gradually approach more closely to that ideal of which our souls have prevision—but that they can never be cancelled nor destroyed.

"It teaches me that the dreams of Communism, of the annihilation or absorption of the individual in the social *whole*, have never been other than fleeting incidents in the life of the human race, reappearing momentarily in every great intellectual and moral crisis, but incapable of realization except upon a trifling scale, as in the Christian Monasteries and Convents.

"I believe in the eternal progressive life of God's creature; in the progress of Thought and Action, not only in the man of the past, but in the man of the future. I believe that it is of little comparative import to determine the form and method of the future progress, but that it is of great import to open up all the paths to progress, by bestowing upon mankind a truly religious education which will enable them to complete it.

"I believe that we can never make man worthier, more loving, nobler, or more divine—which is in fact our end and aim on earth—by merely heaping upon him the means of enjoyment, and setting before him as the aim of life, that irony which is named *happiness*.

"I believe in Association as the sole means we possess of realising progress, not merely because it multiplies the action of the productive forces, but because it tends to unite all the various manifestations of the human mind, and to bring the life of the

individual into communion with the *collective* life of the whole, and I know that association will never be fruitful of good except among free men and free peoples, conscious and capable of their mission.

"I believe that man should be able to eat and live without having every hour of his existence absorbed by material labour, so that he may be able to cultivate the superior faculties of his nature;—but I listen with dread to those who tell you that *enjoyment is your right, and material wellbeing your aim*, because I know that such teachings can only produce egotists, and that these doctrines have been in France, and threaten to be in Italy, the destruction of every noble idea, of every sacrifice, and of every pledge of future greatness.

"The life-destroying ill of Humanity at the present day is the want of a common faith, a common thought, accepted and admitted by all men, and which shall relink earth to Heaven, the universe with God. Deprived of this common faith, man has bowed down before the lifeless Matter, and become a worshipper of the idol *Self-Interest*. And the first priests of that fatal worship were Kings, Princes, and evil Governments. They invented the horrible formula of *each for himself*, for they knew that it would increase egotism, and that there is but one step between the egotist and the slave."

Italian Workmen, brothers! avoid that step! Your future depends upon this.

Yours is the solemn mission to prove that we are all the sons of God, and brethren in Him. You can only prove this by improving yourselves, and fulfilling your duty.

I have pointed out to you, to the best of my power, what your duties are, the most important being those

owed to your country. The amelioration of your present condition can only result from your participation in the political life of the nation. Until you obtain the franchise, your wants and aspirations will never be truly represented.

On the day in which you should follow the example of too many French Socialists, and separate the *social* from the *political* question, saying: *We will work out our own emancipation, whatever be the form of Institution by which our country is governed*—that day you would have yourselves decreed the perpetuity of your own social servitude.

And in bidding you farewell, I will remind you of another duty not less solemn than that which binds you to achieve and preserve the freedom and unity of your Country.

Your complete emancipation can only be founded and secured upon the triumph of a Principle—the principle of the Unity of the Human Family.

At the present day one-half of the Human Family—that half from which we seek both inspiration and consolation, that half to which the first education of childhood is entrusted — is, by a singular contradiction, declared civilly, politically, and socially unequal, and excluded from the great Unity.

To you who are seeking your own enfranchisement and emancipation in the name of a Religious Truth, to you it belongs to protest on every occasion and by every means against this negation of Unity.

The *Emancipation of Woman*, then, must be regarded by you as necessarily linked with the emancipation of the Working-man. This will give to your endeavours the consecration of an Universal Truth.

APPENDIX.

A.

In the autobiographical notes to the Italian edition of his works, Mazzini, alluding to the "tempest of reproaches, accusations, and base calumnies," which burst over his head after the insurrectionary attempt at Milan, says :—

"I will cite one example among hundreds :

"Long before the recommencement of the revolutionary work in Milan, when Louis Kossuth was about to make a journey, of indefinite duration, through the United States of America, it was agreed upon between us that he should sign and leave with me a proclamation to the Hungarian regiments serving in Italy, calling upon them to support any national movement that might take place there; and that I should sign and give to him a proclamation to the Italian regiments serving in Hungary, for the same purpose.

"And we did this.

"Some unforeseen but decisive event might have occurred while we were far apart, and each of us was, therefore, to have full authority to affix a date to the proclamation in his hands and to make use of it when he should think fit.

"I availed myself of the authority thus given, and, at the commencement of the movement, I ordered that

Kossuth's proclamation should be pasted up by the side of one of my own.

"The first news of the insurrection that reached London brought no details, and Kossuth was so roused by the intelligence that he applied to my friend Stansfeld for pecuniary aid in order to join me, which was given.

"But when the news of our defeat arrived, next day, Kossuth, more tender of his own credit than of our friendship, or of the truth, hastened to declare, through the English press, that the proclamation to the Hungarians was purely and simply an invention of my own. On being informed of this by my friends, I wrote a few words to the *Daily News*, simply saying that the original proclamation was still in my hands and might be seen by any one desirous of doing so. This was sufficient for the English public, but the Italian governmental press continued for a long period to accuse me of forgery, and to use Kossuth's name in support of the charge.

"When I returned to London, I did not seek Kossuth; but he came to me, embraced me with the air of one deeply moved, and uttered not a syllable with regard to the proclamation. The alliance between us—unstable as it was—might yet prove useful to our cause; I shrugged my shoulders, and held my peace."

(*Translated from the Scritti editi e inediti di Guis: Mazzini, Vol.* 8, *page* 229.)

Robecchi, Milan, 1871.

B.

[Although the pathetic beauty of expression is necessarily lost in translation, the English reader may

learn somewhat of the religious reverence, the sorrow and the love with which Mazzini's heart yearned towards Rome, from the following extracts from his "*Words addressed to the Youth of Italy*," written in exile shortly after the disgraceful conclusion of the Franco-Italian war in 1859.]

I.

"Come with me: follow me where begins the vast Campagna which, thirteen centuries ago, was the meeting-place of the races of humanity, that I may recall to you where beats the heart of Italy.

"Thither did Goth, Ostrogoth, Erulian, Lombard, and an infinite number of other barbarians and semi-barbarians descend, thereon unconsciously to receive the consecration of Italian civilization, before going forth again upon the various lands of Europe; and the dust which the traveller casts from his shoe, is the dust of nations.

"Silent is the vast campagna: over the wide solitude hovers a silence that oppresses the soul with a sadness like unto that felt by one who wanders through a place of burial. But he who, nurtured in high thought, and strengthened and purified by misfortune, pauses in that solitude at eventide, when the sun has shed his last ray over the long undulating line of the horizon, will hear an indistinct murmur, as of life fermenting beneath; as if it were the quickening stir of generations awaiting the *fiat* of a potent word to call them into being, to repeople a site that appears created for a Council of the Peoples.

"I did hear that thrill, and I prostrated myself before that prophetic sound.

"There, upon the roadway that recalls the name of one of the strong slayers of Cæsar, extending between

the *débris* of extinct volcanos, and the relics of Etruria, between Monterosi and La Storta, close by the lake, lies Baccano. Pause and gaze southward towards the Mediterranean, far as the eye can reach; in the midst of the immense expanse before you, like a Pharos in mid-ocean, rises an isolated point, a sign of distant grandeur. Kneel down in worship—there throbs the heart of Italy; there, in eternal solemnity, lies ROME!

"That isolated point is the capital of the Christian world, and, but a few paces distant, stands the capital of the Pagan world. And these two worlds lie there awaiting a third world; vaster, and more sublime than they, in course of elaboration amid their potent ruins. It is the Trinity of that history whose WORD is in Rome.

"And tyrants and false prophets may delay, but none can prevent the incarnation of the word. For while many cities have perished on earth, and many will yet perish in their turn, Rome is, by decree of Providence, divined by the peoples, the ETERNAL CITY, because to her has been entrusted the mission of diffusing over the world the word of unity. And the life of Rome reproduces itself ever amplified and extended.

"And as the Rome of the Cæsars, having united a vast zone of Europe through the power of action, was succeeded by the Rome of the Popes, which united Europe and America through the power of thought; so will the Rome of the people succeed the other two, and, in the religion of thought and action conjoined, unite Europe and America, and the rest of the terrestrial world.

"And when the Pact of the new faith shall be displayed upon the pantheon of humanity which the nations will one day build up,—between the Capitol and

Vatican, and dominating both—the long dissonance between heaven and earth, soul and body, matter and spirit, reason and faith, will cease into harmony of life.

"And all these things will be when you shall have learned that the life of a people is religion—when, asking counsel only of conscience, and of the tradition, not of the sophists, but of your own nation and the other nations of humanity,—you shall constitute yourselves priests, not of rights, but of Duty, and, rejecting all cowardly compromise, give battle not merely to the civil power of the Lie, but to the Lie itself that now usurps the name of authority in Rome. These things shall be when you remember the prophetic cry which re-awakened Rome sent forth to Italy ten years since, and inscribe upon your banner and upon your hearts :—

We own but one Master in heaven—God; and but one interpreter of His law on earth,—the People."

II.

"The sky was starless, leaden-hued and dark. Descending night had spread over the deep azure a dense, unbroken veil, like a shroud slowly sinking over a corpse. From time to time an icy breeze swept noiselessly over the vast campagna: the long thick grasses bent as noiselessly beneath its breath. I gazed around, and the pure bright visions of the virgin soul rose up before me; the sweet hopes of my young years, fallen, one by one, beneath the icy breath of delusion and discouragement.

"There was sadness in the hour; sadness over earth and heaven, and over the wide silence, a sadness profound, inconsolable, mute. Life seemed suspended without power of revival.

"Slowly enwrapping my whole being like a garment

that takes the impress of the form it covers, there came over me a sense of supreme fatigue, a quiet, passive, weariness of life, and of every earthly thing; a nameless langour, without grief, but worse than every grief,—as it were the death of my soul. And I thought of the long years I had lived through, joyless and un-caressed, in the solitude of an idea; of the friends, dead to earth, or dead to me; of illusions vanished for ever; of men's ingratitude, and of my mother's grave, which I had been unable to approach save in secret and by night, like one bent on a crime—till I felt the need of weeping, weeping, weeping;—but I could not weep.

"And I sat down, broken-spirited, on a stone by the way, and buried my face in my hands, as one who strives to hide from himself the path he has trodden and the path he has yet to tread.

And while I was sitting thus, I seemed to feel, at intervals, a breath upon my forehead, and a faint murmur reached my ear as of voices afar off, or rising through the ground, and I seemed to know those voices.

"And as I rose up and looked anxiously around, it seemed to me that the whole campagna was as if sown with little crosses,* and by the side of every cross there rose a pallid form, now of man, and now of woman. And the faces of some of these were known to me, others not; but all of them seemed to me brothers and sisters of my soul.

"And some of these forms bore upon the breast or forehead a round bloody sign, as of a wound; some of a bloody ribband round the neck; or other mark of sudden and violent death; while others wore no sign save the impress of a long and grievous anguish stamped upon

* The graves of the people in Italy are marked by no headstone, but by little crosses.

every feature—and these were the saddest of all to see. And they gazed mournfully, and as if questioningly upon one another.

"At length, from one of these forms came a sound of voice saying:—

"'*Still forgetful?*'

"And other voices, in accents of deep anguish, answered:—

"'*Still!*'

"And a long wailing groan sounded over the vast campagna. Those spirits, who had smiled in torture and on the scaffold, groaned aloud over the forgetfulness of their living brothers.

"Then a voice rose, saying: 'Did we die for the truth or for falsehood? The will of our Father in heaven gathered us here together, that we might give the signal of the third life of our nation, which shall be when our brethren take heed of the lessons written for them in our blood. And the months pass by, and the years pass by, and the spirits of new martyrs are daily added to our number, but the hour of emancipation sounds not for us.'

"And another voice rose, while the spirit gazed upon the many forms around—'what need they more? Voluntary victims of the foreign foe we fell, to teach them that he who would redeem himself must seek salvation in his own arm and his own weapon only. Wherefore do they still entrust their destiny to the councils and decision of strangers?'

"And a third voice rose:—'Forsaking the sweet shores of the Adriatic, we departed, inspired by the Father, to die in the far Calabrian land, to teach them that each Italian is responsible for all Italians; that each zone of Italian territory is a zone of the common country.

Wherefore are they encamped each on the fragment of territory himself has won, and careless of the sufferings of their brothers a few paces distant?'

"And a fourth voice said:—'We died to teach them that faith without works is falsehood to God and man, and that action is the best training that can be given to a people. Wherefore is the spirit of life manifested but by thousands, while the millions look idly on?'

"And a fifth voice spoke disdainfully:—'Deliberately, solemnly, did we front death and infamy from the many, to teach them that a single weapon may restore equality between the most tyrannic power and the multitude enslaved, if that weapon flash in the hand of one who sets his own life truly at naught, and owns no judges but his conscience and his God. Wherefore, then, do they childishly bewail the tyranny of a single despot?'

"And a female form, bearing no mark of violent death, but the sign of the sorrow of Niobe upon her wasted features, arose, and made as if she fain would speak, but could not; she only pointed with a glance whose reproach seemed to embrace both earth and heaven, to the forms of four youths by her side.

"And after a time of silence, all of those forms broke forth in lament:—'Where is the country promised to our children by those who witnessed our deaths and swore to avenge us? Where is the tomb that should shelter our bones in a free land, beneath the lovely banner for which we laid down our lives? Why are the promises of our loved ones dispersed in air? Wherefore call us great, if our example is unfollowed? Of what avail are the words of affection pompously bestowed upon our memory, if the idea, the desire, the aspiration of our souls is forgotten, perverted, profaned? Have we died for the truth or for falsehood?'

"And a shiver ran through those shadowy forms, and I covered my head in grief and shame.

"And when I looked again, I saw nought but the starless heaven, the vast, desolate campagna, and the long thick grasses bending beneath the icy breeze.

"But often in my dreams does the dolorous vision rise before me again."

C.

[To Mazzini, who believed that "the world is governed by religions" it appeared especially important to emancipate Women from the crushing influence of the religious dogma sanctioned by the Mosaic account of the creation. In answer to an address sent to him while in exile by an Association of Working Women at Genoa, requesting him to accept the title of Honorary Associate, he alludes to the necessity of their freeing themselves from the incubus of this belief. He says:—]

"I accept with gratitude the honour you offer me. As women, as workers, and as daughters of the province where I was born and where my mother lies buried, you have a triple right to my fraternal affection, and your expressions of affection are peculiarly sweet to me."

After assuring them that their efforts at self-emancipation will be aided by all men who sincerely hold the republican faith, he adds:—

"But bear in mind that the inequality which you deplore, dates its origin from a dogma which commenced its course of development by declaring woman created after man and *from* man; and concluded that development by declaring the degradation of the earth. Emancipate yourselves from that dogma and from its representatives;

not by an absurd, immoral denial of all religion, but in the presentiment of the new religious manifestation which will sanctify and teach the doctrine of the *unity* of creation, for you and for us; the indispensable harmony between the two varieties of human nature, and the cessation of every dualism or antagonism rendering that harmony impossible; the doctrine which will proclaim the sanctity and mission of the Family through the equality of the mother, the father, and the children born of them. This advent of this new religious manifestation is—whatever men may say—inevitable; and it is in your power to hasten that advent through your own effort and endeavour.—Adieu, Sisters, accept me, yours in affection,

JOSEPH MAZZINI."

D.

SELECTION FROM THE OFFICIAL ACTS OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.

The following selection is made from those Official Acts of the Republic which were written by Mazzini and issued by the Triumvirate of which he was the guiding spirit.

[The Roman Republic was proclaimed on the 9th February 1849. The Pope had fled to Gaëta two months and a half before, leaving the whole burden of the government in the hands of the chambers. Two deputations had been sent to request him, in the name of the chambers and of the people, to return and resume the reins of government. Both deputations had been repulsed. The Pope had appointed a commission to govern in his name: the persons designated had refused to act.

He had appointed a second commission, which also refused to act. The Chambers appointed a provisional government and declared themselves dissolved. For two months the Provisional Government conducted the administration; after which, yielding to the earnest solicitations addressed to it from all parts of the Papal States, it convoked the people in the primary assemblies, and appealed to the universal suffrage of the inhabitants of the states for the election of a Constituent Assembly. By the votes of 343,000 adult male persons, out of a population of 2,800,000 souls, a Constituent Assembly, consisting of 150 members, met on the 6th February, and at one o'clock in the morning of the 9th, after an uninterrupted sitting of fifteen hours, the decree was passed which declared the abolition of the Secular Papacy, and proclaimed that portion of central Italy, which had hitherto been the patrimony of the Popes, a free and independent Republic.* The article abolishing the secular Papacy was passed with only *five* dissenting votes, and the decree constituting the Republic with only *eleven* dissenting votes, out of one hundred and forty-four members present. On the 10th February the Constituent Assembly appointed an Executive Committee of three citizens (Armellini, Saliceti, and Montecchi) to carry on the government until such time as the Constitution of the Republic should be fully matured.

* Certain Italian critics, more devoted to the letter than to the spirit of republicanism, have severely blamed Mazzini because, at this period, when his influence over the party was practically omnipotent, he counselled the proclamation of the *Roman* not the *Italian* republic. By so doing, however, he remained faithful to the republican principle, and to the Manifesto of YOUNG ITALY, which asserted the Sovereignty of the National will, freely expressed. The populations of the other Italian States were not free, and Mazzini therefore held, that had Rome presumed to speak for them at that time, she would have been guilty of an act of moral usurpation.

On the 13th February the *Monitore Romano* (the official journal) published the following decree:]

The Constituent Assembly decrees:—Laws will be proclaimed and justice will be administered IN THE NAME OF GOD AND THE PEOPLE. All public Acts will be headed, ROMAN REPUBLIC, and will commence with the words: *In the name of God and the people.*

[On the 24th of February the members of the *Mountain,* in the French Constituent Assembly, sent an address of congratulation and promise of fraternal aid to the Roman Constituent Assembly. Being commissioned by the Roman Assembly to reply to that address, Mazzini wrote the following answer:]

I.

Citizens,—Your address reaches us at a solemn moment, on the eve of battle.* It will inspire and encourage us to fresh energy in the holy struggle about to begin. France has done great things for the world: you have hoped, suffered, and fought for humanity, and every word spoken by you imposes upon us duties which, with God's help, we shall know how to fulfil.

You, Citizens, have understood all that there is of great, noble, and providential in this flag of regeneration floating above the city that encircles the Capitol and Vatican,—a new consecration of eternal right; a third world arising upon the ruins of two worlds extinct: an Italy, who will be sister to France, bursting the walls of her sepulchre, and demanding, in the name of the mission she is now destined to fulfil, her right of citizenship in the federation of the peoples. You have understood that our hearts are pure from all hatred or intolerance; that we are fulfilling a work of human improvement and love,

* The renewal of hostilities between Austria and Piedmont.

and that by asserting our rights without attacking the existing religion, by separating the Pope from the Prince, we have assumed the obligation never to contaminate this great work by the base passion and cowardly vengeance of which we have been accused by a corrupt or deluded press. This obligation we shall fulfil: such words as yours are to us a recompense for many calumnies, and an assurance against many a covert betrayal; we know that you will enlighten your fellow-citizens upon the true character of our revolution, and sustain our right to the national life which you have already proclaimed and achieved for yourselves.

There is but one sun in heaven for all the earth; there is but one aim, one law, one faith—*association and progress*—for all the populations of the earth. Like yourselves, we fight for the whole world. The peoples are brothers and will remain such, happen what may.

Trust in us; we will trust in you. If in the coming struggle our strength fail us, we shall remember your promises and cry aloud to you:—*Brothers arise, the hour has come,* and we shall see your volunteers hasten to our aid.

In the days of the empire we fought side by side, and we will fight side by side again for all that men hold most dear—God, the fatherland, liberty, the republic, and the holy alliance of the peoples.

[When the defeat of Charles Albert at Novara restored Lombardy to Austria, and for a time overthrew the Royalist party, the whole duty of continuing the struggle for Italian freedom was thrown upon the republicanism of Italy, represented by the two governments of Rome and Venice. These two governments, the one that of a mere city, the other of a city with the territory

attached, stood firm in defence of the cause of National independence, abandoned by the Royal or Moderate party. When the news of the disaster at Novara reached Rome, the Assembly and Government dissolved the Executive Committee, and placed the supreme power in the hands of a Triumvirate, composed of Armellini, a member of the dissolved Committee; Saffi, late the Minister of the Interior, and Mazzini. The Assembly, in passing this decree, did not, however, abdicate the exercise of its own powers.

The official acts written by Mazzini and issued by the Triumvirate during the first week of its existence are—1st. A proclamation to the people calling upon them to nerve themselves for the defence of their liberties and of the Republic; 2d. A proclamation calling upon all citizens possessing arms, but unable themselves to employ them, to lend them for the service of the State; 3d. A more peremptory order to the same effect; 4th. A decree placing the National Guard of Rome under the orders of the Minister of War; 5th. An Act of the Assembly investing the Triumvirate, provisionally, with the power of pardoning persons under sentence of law. The sixth is the following decree setting apart the buildings till then occupied by the "Holy Office" (Inquisition) in Rome, as lodgings for poor families.]

II.

Whereas, it is the office and duty of a well-organised Republic to provide for the gradual amelioration of the condition of the most necessitous classes;

Whereas, the improvement most urgent at the present moment, is that of withdrawing as many families as possible from the evils resulting from crowded and unhealthy habitations;

Whereas, while the Republic is occupied in endeavouring to select proper localities, both in the provinces and in Rome itself, for the use of the indigent classes, it is a work of republican morality to cancel even the vestiges of past iniquity by consecrating to benevolence that which past tyranny employed for torture, the Constituent Assembly, at the suggestion of the Triumvirs, decrees :—

I. The edifice hitherto used as the *Holy Office* is henceforth appropriated for the habitation of necessitous families or individuals, at a moderate monthly rent. . . .

April 4, 1849.

[A Commission, composed of three representatives of the people, and two civil engineers, was appointed to carry out this decree, and charged with the duty of selecting the most necessitous families, maintaining order and discipline, &c., &c. The seventh Act is a proclamation containing the political programme of the Republic; and the eighth, a decree for the emission of Treasury Bonds to the amount of 251,000 crowns. The proclamation is as follows :—]

III.

Citizens,—Five days have elapsed since we received our sacred mandate from the Assembly. We have carefully studied the actual condition of the Roman States, and that of Italy, our common country. We have sought to interrogate the wishes of the worthiest citizens, and the dictates of our own conscience; and it is now time that the people should hear our voice and learn what are the general principles by which we shall be governed in the execution of the mission imposed upon us.

To provide for the safety of the Republic; to protect it from dangers within and without; to cause it worthily to maintain its ground in the war of independence; such is the task entrusted to us.

This mandate signifies in our eyes respect, not only for a form of government, for a name; but also for the *principle* represented by this name and by this form of government. This principle is for us a principle of love, of civilisation, of fraternal progress by all and for all; of moral, intellectual, and economical improvement for the entire body of the citizens. The Republican flag, raised in Rome by the representatives of the people, does not represent the triumph of one fraction of the citizens over another. It represents the common triumph—a victory—gained by the many, acquiesced in by the immense majority,—of the principle of good over the principle of evil; of the common right over the will of a small number; of holy equality, the gift of God to all the human species, over privilege and despotism. We cannot be republicans without being superior, and proving that we are superior, to the powers now overthrown for ever. Liberty and virtue, the Republic and fraternity, ought to be inseparably united. It is for us to set an example to Europe. The Republic in Rome is an Italian programme; it is a hope, a future for twenty-six millions of men, our brothers. It is bound to prove to Italy and to Europe that our cry of *God and the People* is not a lie; that our work is eminently religious, a work of education and morality; that the accusations of intolerance, anarchy, and violent upturning of things directed against us, are false; that united,—thanks to the Republican principle,—into one family of righteous men, under the eye of God, and following the inspiration of the highest amongst us in genius

and virtue, we advance towards the attainment of true order—the association of Law and Power.

It is thus we understand our mission; and it is thus that we hope all the citizens will learn by degrees to understand it with us. We are not the Government of a party; we are truly the Government of the Nation. The Nation is Republican. The nation embraces all who sincerely profess its republican faith; it pities and instructs all those who do not as yet comprehend the sacredness of that faith; it crushes, in the omnipotence of its sovereignty, all who attempt to violate it by open revolt, or secret intrigues provocative of civil dissensions.

Neither intolerance nor weakness. The Republic is at once conciliatory and energetic. The Government is strong; therefore it is fearless. Its task is to preserve intact the rights, and aid the free performance of the duties of all the citizens; therefore it does not sink into the repose of vain and culpable security. The Nation has conquered—conquered for ever. Its Government ought to exhibit the serene and generous calmness, not the abuse of victory. Inexorable as to principles; tolerant and impartial as to persons; equally incapable of compromise and mistrust; neither fearing offence nor seeking to offend;—such ought a Government to be, in order to be worthy of republican institutions.

Economy in the public offices; morality in the choice of officials; capacity—proved by experience when possible—at the head of the administrative departments.

Severe verification, order, and control in financial matters; limited expenditure, avoidance of all waste; the money of the country devoted exclusively to the good of the country; every sacrifice exacted when demanded by the necessities of the country.

No war of classes; no hostility to existing wealth; no wanton or unjust violation of the rights of property, but a constant disposition to ameliorate the material condition of the classes least favoured by fortune; a firm determination to re-establish the credit of the state, and to check every culpable egotism, either of monopoly, artifice, or passive resistance, tending to dissolve or impair it.

Laws few and well-weighed; but vigilance and firmness in their execution.

The power and discipline of the regular army held sacred to the defence of the country and to the National war for the independence and liberty of Italy.

Such are the general bases of our programme, which will be developed more or less speedily according to circumstances, but never violated by us.

Recently invested with power, surrounded by the abuses fostered by the fallen government, and impeded at every step by the effects of the inertia and hesitation of others, we shall have need of toleration from all; need above all things that none should judge us save by our own acts. Friends to all who desire the well-being of our common country; pure in intention if not great in intellect; surrounded by circumstances the gravest that ever befell a people or their government, we shall have need of the active aid of all, of the harmonious, fraternal, and pacific work of all. And this we hope to have. The country ought not, it must not, go back: it ought not, it will not, fall into anarchy. Let all good men assist us; God, who has decreed the resurrection of Rome and the nationality of Italy, will be with us.

April 5, 1849.

[From the date of the foregoing proclamation till the

26th of April, when the news was spread in Rome that the French troops had landed at Civita Vecchia, the triumvirs carried out their programme to the letter. Among their official acts, written by Mazzini, during this period (5th to 26th April), are a letter to the President of the Assembly, reassuring the people that the triumvirs had no intention, as had been falsely rumoured, of treating with foreigners for the restoration of the Pope, a decree inflicting a fine on the canons of the Chapter of the Vatican for refusing their services at an act of worship ordered by the government to take place on Easter day; a decree establishing *bureaux* of statistics throughout the republic, for the collection and arrangement of accurate data on which the government might proceed in its intended measures of civil, economical, and legal reform; a decree inflicting penalties on defaulters who had failed to contribute to the forced loan ordered by the Assembly; a decree for the emission of notes until the coinage of the new currency; a decree and proclamation of the triumvirs announcing an unshaken resolution to carry on the struggle for Italian independence, and the decree of the 15th April, which, after setting forth that it should be the "constant aim of Republican institutions, progressively to ameliorate the condition of the masses," and that the high price of salt had "an injurious effect upon agriculture, the fisheries, trade, commerce, and the health of the poor," reduced the duty on every description of salt to one *bajocco* for every Roman pound. Mazzini also wrote the following decree appropriating and leasing certain portions of the Roman territory for cultivation by the agricultural poor.]

IV.

Whereas there is no more appropriate and speedy method of rendering the labours of the agriculturist lucrative, and of benefiting a most numerous and useful class; of strengthening their affection for their country, and interesting them in the organisation of the great reform; of improving the soil and its cultivators at one and the same time, by the emancipation of both—than that of parcelling out a large portion of the vast rural possessions now actually administered, or to be administered by the State, into small leasehold allotments at a moderate annual rent, redeemable at any given time, to one or several families of the poorest peasants, under such regulations and conditions as shall be deemed most fitting to ensure the speediest, most just, and most stable execution of so salutary a purpose, it is decreed:—

Article 1. A large portion of the rural domains belonging to religious corporations or other *main mortes* of whatsoever description, in whatsoever portion of the Roman territory, which either are or are to be placed under the administration of the State, shall be immediately divided into a given number of portions, sufficient for the maintenance of one or more necessitous families having no other means of subsistence, who shall hold them in free and permanent leasehold in consideration of a moderate *canon* payable to the State, redeemable at any given time from the leasehold.

Article 2. A special regulation will distinctly determine the method of proceeding by which this salutary provision shall be effectuated.

Article 3. Analogous measures will be taken with regard to the *fondi urbani*, arising from the same or from similar sources, with a view of providing better and less costly habitations for the poorer classes.

Article 4. The measures already announced with regard to the fitting payment of the expenses of public worship, the pastoral administration of parishes, and other establishments of public interest, either through payment in kind, the produce of leaseholds or other public monies belonging to the provincial or municipal authorities, will remain in force.

Article 5. The ministers of finance and of the interior are respectively charged with the execution of the present law.

April 15, 1849.

[On the 16th April the triumvirate issued a decree relative to the organisation of the army; on the 21st an act abolishing the tobacco monopoly; on the 23d an address to the army, and on the 25th a decree suspending the tax on shopkeepers, and remitting the arrears of this tax. This last decree was intended as a small boon to the national guard of Rome, which, having been formed before the inauguration of the Republic, with a Conservative aim, consisted almost entirely of middle-class shopkeepers, to the exclusion of the working men; yet this body, amounting to about 13,000 men, had shown such enthusiasm in their military duties as to prove it was heartily republican in conviction and sympathy. During this period the Triumvirate had also to deal with the sole instance of disorder which occurred in the Roman states during the Republic. A serious riot broke out in Ancona on the arrival of the intelligence of the defeat of Charles Albert by the Austrians, and various assassinations took place, "chiefly of persons of respectability supposed to entertain principles opposed to the revolutionary government."

The Triumvirate, as soon as these facts were known

to it, despatched a representative of the people with special instructions to put an end to a state of things disgraceful to the republic and giving the lie to its principles, and armed him with full powers to use military force for the arrest and punishment of the assassins. Their instructions to him, written by Mazzini, were "to restore the town of Ancona to the Republic, ... Rome cannot, by inactivity or a false moderation, resign herself to the imputation of being an accomplice in assassination, ... for the sake of morality and to prevent reaction, for which the absence of security would be the best pretext, ... justice must be done upon the crimes that have been committed . . . . we regard organized assassination as the worst of reactions, and the republic is lost if, instead of representing the country, it confine itself to the representation of a faction. The promoters and directors of the assassinations must be arrested and dealt with according to law; subordinates who may be thought to have been misled or deceived, may be dealt with in a spirit of clemency as far as compatible with law. . . . . You will have under your orders the police, the national guard, and all the troops now at Ancona.

"The government is resolved to have its orders executed, even were it necessary to concentrate on Ancona half the forces of the State."

[Two days later, as the disturbances continued, Saffi wrote further instructions for "striking down the guilty and protecting the laws, the order, and the honour of the republic," and Mazzini, on his own responsibility, addressed the following letter to the commissioner at Ancona:—]

"Since your departure, it has transpired that the number of police at Ancona is inferior to what was

counted on. On the other hand, the reports received render it all important to proceed energetically with measures of repression and punishment against those who are guilty of the atrocities that have occurred. Orders have, therefore, been sent by express to Ascoli, to send you by the most rapid means a portion of the 2d Leggieri regiment. When this force reaches you, *act;* half measures do no good. Besides the crime which stains the flag of the republic—besides the cry which unjustly accuses the government of connivance or culpable moderation, we have threatening remonstrances from without—France and England. There must be rapid and severe dealing; and we count for this on your zeal.

"Have an understanding with the governor of Ancona. Go on with the arrests. Organize a commission after the manner of a council of war, with a defender of the law for the prosecution, and an advocate for the prisoners, chosen by you from among the military men, or lawyers of the place. *If necessary, place Ancona in a state of siege, till our task is accomplished.*—

"Yours, J. MAZZINI, *Triumvir.*"

[In obedience to this last order the commissioner of the republic, by decree of the 27th April, placed Ancona in a state of siege, and that city was "restored to the republic."

The resolute conduct of the Roman government, in the affair of Ancona, is the more remarkable when it is remembered that at the very time when the triumvirs were sending despatches to Ancona, threatening to concentrate upon it half the troops of the states, rather than suffer it to continue in a condition disgraceful to the republic, these troops were all too little for a work of absolute life or death to the republic—the repulse of the

French invaders. On the very day when Ancona was placed in a state of siege, the French army was on its march from Civita Vecchia to Rome; and the same number of the *Monitore*, April 30th, in which the proclamation of the state of siege of Ancona appeared, contained also the hurried orders of the Triumvirs, establishing hospitals, and making other necessary preparations for the expected attack on Rome.

Then followed the first French attack upon Rome, their repulse, and the glorious and protracted defence of the city. The history of this period is authentically recorded in the official documents written by Mazzini and issued by the Triumvirate, which prove that the government remained to the last true to its high principles, its spirit of pacific reform, and its respect for law or order. The Triumvirate thus announced to the population the arrival of the French troops before Civita Vecchia.]

V.

Romans,—The territory of the Republic is threatened by foreign intervention. A body of French troops has appeared before Civita Vecchia.

Whatever may be their intentions, the maintenance of the Principle of Government freely accepted by the people, the right of Nations, and the honour of the Roman name, command the Republic to resist.

The Republic will resist. It is necessary that the people should prove to France and to the world that they are not a people of children, but a people of men, and of men who once gave laws and civilization to Europe. It is necessary that none should be able to say that *the Romans desired to be free but knew not how.* It is necessary that the French nation should learn from our

resistance, our declarations, and our whole bearing, that we are firmly resolved never again to submit to the Government we overthrew.

The people will prove this. They who think otherwise dishonour the people and are traitors to their country.

Order, solemn tranquillity and serious energy. The Government is on the watch inexorably to prevent any attempt to excite anarchy, or any act injurious to the Republic. Citizens, organize yourselves and rally round us. God and the people, law and energy will be triumphant.

April 25, 1849.

[At the same time Mazzini drew up the following Protest, which the Assembly sent the same day to General Oudinot.]

VI.

The Roman Assembly, disturbed by the threatened invasion of the territory of the Republic, feeling that this invasion, in no way provoked by the conduct of the Republic towards foreign powers, unpreceded by any communication from the French Government, and calculated to excite anarchy in a country calmly reposing in the consciousness of its rights and the order and concord of its citizens, is a violation alike of the rights of nations, the guarantees offered by the French constitution, and the bonds of fraternity which should unite the two Republics—protests in the name of God and the people against the unlooked-for invasion, declares its firm determination to resist, and holds France responsible for the consequences.

[On the 26th April the Assembly solemnly committed

the safety of the Republic to the Triumvirate, and commissioned them to resist force by force.

On the 27th the Triumvirate issued the following decree empowering members of religious orders to withdraw from the observance of the laws and regulations of the bodies to which they belonged.]

VII.

Whereas all religious vows are simply a moral obligation between the human conscience and God;

Whereas a civil state has no right as such to interfere by any extrinsic and material means in the sphere of spiritual duty;

Whereas the life and capacity of every man belong of right to the Society and Country wherein he has been placed by Providence;

Whereas the State cannot recognise as irrevocable any promises which deprive it of the services, or restrain the free will and action of the citizens;

The Triumvirate decrees:—

The State does not recognise the perpetuity of the vows uttered by individuals belonging to the so-called regular religious orders.

Every individual, to whatsoever religious order he may belong, is empowered to withdraw from the rules and observances to which he bound himself upon taking the religious vows.

The State will protect all those who determine to avail themselves of the present decree, from violence or opposition.

The State will gratefully receive into the ranks of its army any Priests who may be desirous of joining in the defence of the country for which they have until now offered up their prayers to God.

The present decree will be read aloud by a Government Commissioner to the Members of the Religious Corporations assembled in full community in their respective Convents.

27th April 1849.

[The decree of the 15th of April having proclaimed that a large portion of the uncultivated lands held by the various religious corporations and other *main mortes* had been declared by the vote of the Assembly of the 21st February to be the property of the Republic;—another decree of the 27th April provided for the execution of that measure. On the 28th the Triumvirate issued the decree for the protection of French residents in Rome.]

VIII.

Having faith in the generous principles, as well as in the courage of the Roman people; being convinced that, although determined to defend the independence of their country to the last extremity against all invasion—the people of Rome do not consider the French people responsible for the errors and faults of their government:

Relying unboundedly on the people, and on the sanctity of the republican principle;

The Triumvirate decrees:—

All foreigners, and especially the French, dwelling peaceably in Rome, are placed under the guardianship of the nation;

Whosoever shall attempt to do them the least injury shall be held guilty of an offence against the honour of Rome.

The Government will take care that no one shall violate the duties of hospitality.

April 28, 1849.

[Such were the documents put forth in the midst of a city engaged in preparing arms and ammunition for defence against a besieging army of 30,000 men. The defence of their city appeared as if destined for the moral education of the Roman people, the magnanimity of the Triumvirs diffused itself through the hearts of the whole people. The first attack, and the splendid repulse of the French troops under Oudinot, took place on the 30th April. A few days later 15,000 Neapolitans, commanded by King Bomba in person, invaded the Roman territory, and marched within fifteen miles of the city. The Triumvirate issued the following proclamations:]

IX.

Romans!—A body of Neapolitan troops has passed the frontier, and appears to be moving in the direction of Rome.

Their purpose is to re-establish the Pope in absolute temporal power. Their weapons are persecution, ferocity and pillage. Their ranks encircle the King to whom Europe has given the name of the *Bombarder* of his subjects, and around him stand the most determined of the conspirators of Gaëta.

Romans!—We have conquered our first assailants; we will conquer the second. The blood of our Sicilian brothers weighs heavily upon the head of the traitor king. God, who confounds the wicked and strengthens the defenders of the right, has chosen you, O Romans! as avengers. The will of God and of our country be done.

In the name of the rights common to all countries, and in the name of the duty Rome owes to Italy and Europe,—in the name of the Italian mothers who have cursed that king, and of the Roman mothers who will

bless the defenders of their children,—in the name of our liberties, our conscience, and our honour,—in the name of God and the people—we will resist. We will resist, soldiers and people, capital and province. Be Rome as inviolable as eternal justice. We have learned that in order to conquer, it suffices to fear not death. Long live the Republic!

May 2, 1849.

X.

People of the Republic!—The Neapolitan troops have invaded our territory and are marching upon Rome.

Let the war of the People begin.

Rome will do her duty—let the provinces do theirs.

The moment has arrived to make a supreme effort. All who believe in the dignity of their immortal soul, in the inviolability of their rights, in the sanctity of their oaths, in the justice of the Republic, in the independence of the peoples, and in Italian honour, are this day bound in duty to act. For all who hold dear their liberty, their homes, their families, the beloved one, their native land, their life,—action is a necessity. Citizens, your life, liberty, property, rights,—all are threatened; they seek to tear all from you.

The banner raised by the king of Naples is for us the banner of despotism and unlimited tyranny. His first footprints are printed in blood. The lists of proscription are traced in blood.

You have too long been content with words, whilst others conspired and laid in wait. Be not deceived. You have to-day to choose between exile, poverty, and the scaffold, or battle and victory. People of the Republic, all hesitation or uncertainty would be cowardice, and useless cowardice.

Arise then and act. The decisive hour has sounded. Slavery such as you have never known, or liberty worthy of your ancient glory, lasting security and the applause of all Europe. Arise then and arm. Let it be war; inexorable, universal war, since they will have it so, and it will be brief.

While Rome assails the enemy in front, surround and molest them on the flank and rear.

Rome will be central nucleus of the national army, of which the provinces will furnish the flying squadrons.

Resist in whatever way you may. Whenever local defence is impossible, let every fifty men form a guerrilla band, every ten a national squadron; let each man of undoubted honesty, who can rally ten others round him, be their chief. Let each Prefect direct a centre of insurrection and give commissions to chiefs of guerrilla bands or squadrons. The Republic will take note of all the names, and assign rewards in money, land and honour. The brevets will serve as *feuilles de route*, which will be recognised by the Communes as giving the right of free passage and of succour. The guerrilla bands and flying squadrons will avoid regular encounters with the enemy, but harass them, destroy their repose, cut off their provisions and stragglers, annoy and distress them, surrounding them as with an iron web, impeding their movements and wearying them out. Let insurrection at once become the daily life, the pulse, the breath of every patriot. Let the inactive be punished with infamy; traitors with death.

Let the Republic be as terrible in war as it has been great in peace. Let Europe learn that we are determined to live, and that we know how. God and the people will bless our arms.

May 2, 1849.

[The following proclamations of the Triumvirs were issued four days after the first attack by the French army.]

XI.

Romans!—Your Triumvirs have solemnly pledged themselves to prove to Europe that you are superior to your assailants,—that the accusations cast upon you are calumnious,—that the Republican principle has destroyed the germs of anarchy sown by the former Government, and which only a renewal of the past could revive, —that you are not only brave but virtuous, that law and courage are in your eyes the breath and soul of the Republic.

On these conditions your Triumvirs are proud to remain at your head; on these conditions, they will, if need be, join you on the barricades. Be these conditions inviolable as the love that unites the people with its government, as the resolution of both people and government to maintain the banner of the Republic unsullied and pure from every stain.

Persons are inviolable. The Government alone has the right to punish.

Property is inviolable. Every stone of Rome is sacred. The Government alone has the right to modify the inviolability of property when public utility renders it necessary.

No one is allowed to make arrests, or domiciliary perquisitions without the direction or assistance of the head of a military post.

Foreigners are under the special protection of the Republic. All the citizens are responsible for the reality of this protection.

The military commission recently organised, will

deliver speedy judgment, according to the necessities of the exceptional state of affairs and the public safety, upon all acts of sedition, reaction, anarchy, or violation of the laws.

The national guard, which has shown itself ready to fight for the Republic, will also be ready to keep our honour pure from all reproach in the face of Europe. The national guard is specially charged with the preservation of order, and with the execution of the above-mentioned regulations.

May 4, 1849.

[Decree regarding the inviolability of public monuments.]

XII.

Whereas, works of art, and moveables existing in monuments and public establishments, or other places belonging to the state, are national property, which cannot be spoiled or taken away without criminality towards the Republic;

The triumvirate decrees :—

The national property is placed under the safeguard of the Roman people.

Spoilers or robbers of such works of art will be regarded as enemies of the Republic and of the national honour, and as such will be punished with all the rigour of the law.

The trial of such crimes is entrusted to a military commission.

4th May 1849.

[The Neapolitan army having been utterly routed by the troops under Garibaldi, fled in disorder into their

own territory. The triumvirate then issued the following proclamation regarding the Neapolitan prisoners.]

XIII.

Romans,—Some Neapolitan prisoners, the first fruits of the victory we are to gain, are to come into the town.

IN THE NAME OF GOD AND THE PEOPLE, THEIR PERSONS ARE TO BE HELD SACRED.

They are Italians deceived—deceived by the king, who leads them. Let them be made aware that their brothers are here, under the banner of the Republic; and that here, and not in the camp of a traitor, is the Italian cause defended. Let them be made aware that the Romans know as well how to pardon as how to conquer.

Long live the Republic!

5th of May 1849.

Two days later, a still nobler act of grace took place:—

[Decree setting free upwards of four hundred French prisoners.]

XIV.

Whereas, Rome and the French people are not, and cannot be, at war with each other;

Whereas, Rome, in virtue of her right and her duty, defends her inviolability, but deplores every attack directed against the two republics as a crime against their common faith;

Whereas, the Roman people does not regard soldiers, who fought from obedience, as responsible for the actions of a mistaken government;

The triumvirate decrees:—

Article 1. The French, made prisoners on the 30th of April, are free, and shall be sent back to the French camp.

Article 2. The Roman people will, at noon, bid a fraternal adieu to the brave soldiers of the French republic, our sister.*

7th of May 1849.

[The triumvirate then issued the following proclamation to the French army.]

XV.

Soldiers of the French republic—

You are for the second time led as enemies beneath the walls of Rome, of the republican city that was at once the cradle of liberty and of military valour.

Your leaders are urging you to fratricide.

And that fratricide, were it possible to effect it, would be a mortal blow to the liberties of France. The peoples are responsible for and towards one another. The destruction of our Republic would leave an ineffaceable stain upon your banner, would deprive France of an ally in Europe, would be a new step taken upon the path of monarchical restoration, towards which your great and beautiful country is being led by a government either deceiving or deceived.

* Commander A. Cooper Kay, writing to Admiral Parker on the 10th May, says: "On the afternoon of the 7th, the Roman government decided on releasing the French prisoners. They were brought out in the streets, and received with every mark of good feeling by the people, who cheered them, gave them food, and showed them round St. Peter's and the monuments; the French, in return, saying that they had been deceived, having entered the Roman territory with the idea that they were to join the Romans against the Austrians and Neapolitans. They were then permitted to return to their own head-quarters."

Rome, therefore, will fight as she has fought. She knows how to fight for your liberty and for her own.

Soldiers of the French Republic, while you are advancing against our tri-coloured flag, the Russians, the men of 1815, are advancing against Hungary and looking towards France.

A few miles distant from you, a body of Neapolitan troops, defeated by us a few days since, yet bears aloft the flag of despotism and intolerance. A few leagues to our left, Leghorn, another republican city, is, at this present writing, engaged in resisting an Austrian invasion. Your post is there.

Tell your leaders to fulfil what they said to you. Remind them that they promised in Marseilles and Toulon to lead you against the Croats. Remind them that French soldiers bear the honour and liberties of France upon the point of their bayonets.

French soldiers! soldiers of liberty! Do not attack men who are your brothers. May the two tri-colour banners intertwined advance to the emancipation of the peoples and the destruction of tyranny! God, France, and Italy will bless your arms.

Long live the French Republic! long live the Roman Republic!

10*th May* 1849.

[On the 17th May hostilities were suspended between the French army and the Roman Republic, Monsieur Lesseps, the Plenipotentiary of the French Republic, having opened negotiations with the Roman government. This gentleman had no sooner arrived in Rome and examined matters for himself, than he became convinced that the French government had proceeded on a complete mistake if they imagined that the people of

Rome were willing to accept a French settlement of their national affairs, and he wrote to General Oudinot as follows :—

"In the critical situation we are in, it appears to me extremely important to avoid every species of engagement. I see a whole town in arms. . . . I find here, at the first glance, the aspect of a population determined to resist; and rejecting all exaggerated estimates, one may reckon on at least about 25,000 determined combatants. If we enter by sheer force into Rome, we shall pass over, not merely the bodies of some foreign adventurers, but we shall leave on the pavement men of the middle class, shopkeepers and young men of family; —all those classes, in short, that defend order and society in Paris."

("Ma Mission à Rome." Memoire presenté au Conseil d'Etat, Par Ferdinand Lesseps, p. 23.)

[M. Lesseps, as Plenipotentiary from the French Republic, commenced his negotiations with the Roman Government, by forwarding to Mazzini three propositions for the acceptance of the Assembly. In the letter enclosing these propositions, M. Lesseps requested Mazzini to furnish him with some notes as to the condition of the Roman Republic. Mazzini wrote in answer as follows :—

[Letter to M. Lesseps, Plenipotentiary of the French Republic.]

XVI.

Sir,—You have asked us for some notes as to the present condition of the Roman Republic. You shall have them from me, dictated with the sincerity which

has been my invariable rule during twenty years of political life. We have no reason to hide or to mask anything. We have been lately the object of strange calumnies in Europe; but our answer to those who have listened to those calumnies has always been, *come and see.* You, Sir, are now amongst us; you are sent to verify the truth of these accusations. Do so. Your mission may be fulfilled with perfect freedom. We, all of us, heard of that mission with pleasure, because it can only result in our justification.

France undoubtedly does not intend to dispute our right to govern ourselves as we choose; the right of drawing from the heart of the country, so to speak, the ruling idea of that country's life, and making of it the foundation of our institutions. France cannot intend other than to say to us: "While I recognise your independence, it is my duty to ascertain that it is the result of the free and spontaneous vote of the majority. Bound as I am to the other governments of Europe and desirous of peace,—should I find it true that a minority among you are holding in check the wishes of the Nation—if it should prove true that your actual form of Government is the mere caprice of a faction substituted for the common will, I could not see with indifference the peace of Europe continually endangered by the passions and anarchy inseparable from every Government of Faction."

We concede this right to France, because we believe in the solidarity of nations in the cause of good. But at the same time we affirm that if ever there existed a Government sprung from the will of the majority, ours is that Government.

The Republic was implanted amongst us by the will of an assembly sprung from universal suffrage; it has

been received with enthusiasm, and has encountered no opposition. And observe, Monsieur, that never would opposition have been easier, never less dangerous—I will even say never so provoked,—not indeed by the acts of the government—but by the peculiarly unfavourable circumstances in which it was placed at its commencement.

The country emerged from the long anarchy inherent in the inmost organisation of the fallen government. The agitations inseparable from every great change, fomented by the emergencies of the Italian question, and by the efforts of the retrograde party, had thrown it into a state of feverish agitation, which laid it open to any daring enterprise, to any appeal to interests and passions. We had no army—no repressive force; and in consequence of past abuses, our finances were impoverished—exhausted. The religious question, handled by able and interested men, might have served as a pretext for agitation among a population gifted with magnificent instincts and aspirations, but unenlightened. Nevertheless, as soon as the republican principle was proclaimed, one, first, incontestable *fact* became evident, ORDER.

The history of the Papal Government offers constant periodical *émeutes*; the story of the Republic not a single one. The assassination of Rossi,* a fact deplorable, but isolated—an individual excess, rejected, condemned by all, provoked, perhaps, by his own imprudent

* The assassination of Rossi took place on the 15th of November in the last days of Papal dominion, more than three months before the formation of the Republic. It was committed amid the acclamations that hailed the Mamiani Ministry, and followed by the Cabinet of which he was president. It should not in justice be forgotten that the ministry repudiated all knowledge of, or connection with that act. Mazzini was at that time in Switzerland, and did not arrive in Rome until four months later.—(*Translator.*)

conduct, and the authorship of which remains unknown, was followed by order the most complete.

In the meantime the financiary crisis increased. By the most culpable intrigues, the credit of the paper of the Republic had been lowered to such an extent that it could only be discounted at 41 or 42 per cent. The bearing of the other governments of Italy and of Europe became more and more hostile towards us. These material difficulties and our political isolation failed to disturb the tranquillity of our people. They had an unshaken faith in the future results of the new principle.

Now, in the midst of the actual crisis, in the face of French, Austrian, and Neapolitan invasion, our credit is improving; our paper is only at 12 per cent. discount, our army is daily augmented, and our populations are making ready to act as our reserve.

You see Rome, Sir, and you know of the heroic struggle sustained by Bologna. I am writing alone, in the midst of the most profound tranquillity. The garrison quitted the town yesterday evening, and, before the arrival of new troops, at midnight, our gates, our walls, our barricades, were, by a simple word passed from mouth to mouth, manned, without noise, without boasting, by the people in arms. Deep in the very heart of this people there is a clear determinate resolve—the abolition of the temporal power invested in the Pope;—a hatred of the Government of the priests, in whatsoever mitigated or altered form it may be presented. Hatred, I say, not of the men, but of the Government.

Towards individuals, our people have always, thank God, shown themselves generous, since the establishment of the Republic; but the mere idea of the clerical government, of the king-priest, makes them thrill with indignation. They will struggle with energy against

every project of restoration. They will rush into schism* sooner than submit.

Partly in consequence of certain obscure threats, but more from the absence of all the habits of political life, a certain number of electors had abstained from voting at the time of the election of the Assembly.

This fact appeared to weaken the expression of the general will. A second fact, decisive and vital, put an end to all possibility of doubt a short time since.

Shortly before the constitution of the Triumvirate, the re-election of the Municipalities occurred. The universality of electors presented themselves to vote. The municipal element always and everywhere represents the conservative element of a State. Some feared that through it a spirit of retrogression might be introduced amongst us.

Well, amid the roar of the tempest around us,—after the intervention had taken place,—while all appearances appeared to limit the existence of the Republic to days alone,—the municipalities sent in the most complete and spontaneous adhesion to the form of government

* The effect produced by these words upon M. Lesseps may be inferred from the following extract :—

"A first message sent to the Roman Assembly had for its object to direct its attention to manœuvres, which I believe to be contrary to the influence of France, as well as to the interests of Italy. These manœuvres concerned the great question of a religious schism, or a new Protestantism. The following note, which I transcribe from my memorandum-book, indicates the motives of my procedure. 'I suspect Mazzini—a remarkable and very influential man—of wishing to favour a religious schism : his writings ought to make one fear it. He has frequent conferences with English travellers ; he sees Protestant Missionaries of all nations. To seek to remove him from these influences, and to persuade him that France, which he distrusts, ought to be the sole hope of Italian liberty ; to turn him from his ideas of schism, and, if need be, to denounce those tendencies to the patriots of the Assembly, making them regard them as treason to the cause of Italian liberty, which cannot exist apart from Catholicism.'"—"Ma Mission à Rome," p. 38.

chosen. To the addresses sent up from the various clubs, and from the headquarters of the National Guard, were added, in the early part of the present month, those of all the municipalities with the exception of two or three. I have the honour, Sir, to forward you the list. They explicitly declare their devotion to the Republic, and their conviction that the two powers* are incompatible in one individual. This is, allow me to repeat it, a decisive fact; a second legal proof confirming the first, and forming the indestructible basis of our right.

When the two questions—the Republic and the abolition of the Temporal Power—were put to the Assembly, a few of the members, more timid than their colleagues, thought that the inauguration of the Republic in the face of the actual organisation of Europe, was premature and rash; but there was not a single vote against the dethronement of the King-Priest; both the right and the left were united in that idea.

Could a free government dare to propose to such a people a return to the past, without being guilty of crime and inconsistency? That return—reflect on this, Sir—would be equivalent to a renewal of the former disorders, to the formation of *secret societies* for purposes of resistance, to anarchy in the heart of Italy, to a spirit of vengeance awakened in a people which now asks only to forget. That return would light a flame of permanent warfare in Europe; it would be the programme of the extreme parties substituted for the organised Republic we represent. Can France desire this? Can her Government desire it? Can the nephew of Napoleon? Their persistence in hostile designs in the face of the Neapolitan and Austrian invasion, would recall the dismemberment

* The Temporal and Spiritual Powers.

of Poland. And remember, moreover, Sir, that such designs could only be realised by planting the banner which the people have overthrown, upon a heap of corpses, upon the ruins of our city.

You will shortly receive another letter from me upon this subject.

16*th May* 1849.

[The propositions of the French Plenipotentiary to the Assembly were as follows :—

1. *The Roman States request the fraternal protection of the French Republic :*

2. *The Roman populations have the right of freely deciding upon their form of Government :*

3. *Rome will receive the French army as an army of brothers, etc.*

These propositions were rejected by the Assembly, and Mazzini announced the fact to M. Lesseps in the following letter :—]

XVII.

Sir,—We have the honour to transmit to you the decision of the Assembly with regard to the project communicated by you to the commission. The Assembly is unable to accept it. We are desired to express to you the regret felt by the Assembly, and the reasons which have determined its refusal.

And it is with deep sorrow, natural to men who love France and still trust her, that we, Sir, fulfil the duty entrusted to us.

When, after the decree of your Assembly which *required the Government at once to take measures to prevent the Italian expedition from being diverted from its professed aim,* we heard of your arrival, our hearts

bounded with joy. We believed in the immediate reconciliation in one sole principle—the principle proclaimed by us and by yourselves—of two peoples, whose naturally friendly dispositions towards each other, whose memories, common interest, and political position inclined them to affection and esteem. We thought that, having been chosen to verify the state of things, and struck by the absolute harmony that links the various elements of our state in one, your communications would have destroyed the only obstacle to our wishes, and the only doubt able to delay France in the fulfilment of the noble idea expressed by the decision of your Assembly.

Harmony, internal peace, a well-weighed determination, enthusiasm and generosity of conduct, the voluntary and formal vote of our municipalities, national guard, troops, people, government, and sovereign Assembly in favour of the existing system of institutions,—all these things have been made evident to you. You have declared this, no doubt, to France; and we had therefore good right to hope that, speaking in the name of France, you would have addressed us in terms very different from those contained in your project.

The Assembly has observed the manner in which the words *Roman Republic* are studiously avoided in your first article; and has inferred from their suppression an unfavourable intention towards it.

It appeared to the Assembly that, with the exception of the greater importance given to it by your name and authority, your project contained little more than was contained in certain acts of the General, previous to the 30th April. Having irrefutably ascertained the opinion of our people, why persist in insulting them by the proposal of occupying Rome? Rome has no need of

protection: there are no combatants within her walls, and should any enemy approach them from without, Rome will defend herself with her own forces. Rome is at present able to protect herself upon her Tuscan frontier, and in Bologna. The Assembly has therefore seen in your third article a political intention, which it cannot think of accepting; less than ever since the decree of the French Assembly, showing it to be decidedly adverse to an occupation which circumstances neither provoke nor require.

We cannot conceal from you, Sir, that the disastrous coincidence of the information received relating to the circle of our defence, has contributed to the decision of the Assembly. A nucleus of the French army has this very day passed the Tiber in violation of the spirit of the truce, and thus narrowed the circle of military operations around the capital. Nor is this, Sir, an insolated act. The popular distrust already excited by the idea of seeing the city occupied by foreigners, is so much increased as to render very difficult, if not impossible, any compromise in a matter which the Assembly, on its part, regards as vital to our dignity and independence.

For this and other reasons, the project has unwillingly been judged inadmissible by the Assembly. We shall have the honour of transmitting to you, Sir, to-morrow, in fulfilment of its instructions, a proposition, inferior certainly to our just hopes, but which would at least have the advantage of removing all danger of collision between two Republics founded upon identical rights and similar aspirations.—Receive, Sir, &c.

19*th May* 1849.

[Proclamation on the seizure of the confessionals by the people for barricades.]

XVIII.

Romans!—Yesterday some among you, moved by rumours of new dangers, have, in a moment of unreflecting zeal, seized upon some of the confessionals belonging to the churches, for the purpose of using them as barricades.

The act would be serious and deserving of punishment, were we not to take into consideration your intentions.

You intended by that demonstration once more to prove that all things are possible in Rome except the re-establishment of the priestly government. You desired to give expression to the idea that there is not, there cannot be any true religion in a country which is not free; and that the cause of our free and immortal souls is centred in the citizens' barricades.

But the enemies of our holy Republic, in every part of Europe, are on the watch to give evil interpretation to your actions, and to accuse the people of irreverence and irreligion. He who should furnish any ground for such accusations would be a traitor to his country. Romans! Your city is great and inviolable among all the cities of Europe, because it was the cradle and guardian of religion. God protects and will protect the Republic, because its sacred name is never divided from that of the people; and because we are fighting for His law of liberty and love, while elsewhere men fight for interest and ambition which profane and destroy every religion. In those churches, sanctuaries of the religion of our fathers, prayers will be raised while we are fighting, to the God of the redeemed.

From those confessionals, whence too often have issued words of corruption and slavery, in violation of the

teachings of Christ—will also go forth—forget it not—words of consolation to the aged mothers of those who are fighting for the Republic.

Brothers in the blessed cause of God and the People —Your Triumvirs ask from you a proof of trust, in answer to the accusations to which such an imprudent act has given rise. Do you yourselves carry back to the churches the confessionals which yesterday you removed from them.* The citizens' barricades will be defended by their breasts.

20th May 1849.

[Proclamation announcing the capitulation of Bologna.]

XIX.

People of the Republic!—The Austrian is advancing. Bologna has fallen—fallen after eight days of sublime valour and sacrifice; she fell as others triumph. Let her last cry be the cry of war and vengeance for us all; let every Italian heart take it up as a sacred legacy. Citizens! Rome asks from you a supreme effort: she asks it with the certainty that it will be made; for the blood shed by her sons on the 30th has authorised her to make the claim.

By sending in your adhesion to our programme when the danger had already begun, you have borne solemn testimony before Italy and Europe to your community of faith with us. We now ask of you another proof—that of action. Be every man ready to seal his testimony with his blood. Let every city, every village, every homestead, arise to avenge Bologna. Let every steeple sound a knell, the doom decreed by the people to their

* The confessionals were immediately taken back to the churches by the people.

foreign invaders. From gorge to gorge upon your mountains, kindle as symbol of fraternal anger the fires that in 1847 were the signal of revolution. Let the red flag float from every steeple and tower on every side. Let the rage of battle thrill from province to province, from homestead to homestead. Let the enemy, let Italy, let Europe know that here, in the heart of the Peninsula, are three millions of men bound together by a solemn oath to resist; irrevocably resolved to fight to the last; to bury themselves beneath the ruins of their country rather than yield. And while heaven stands no human power can forbid our victory. Three millions of the people are omnipotent when they declare: we *will*. Italians, sons of Rome! Soldiers of the Republic! this is a solemn hour, elaborated by the ages, one of those historic moments which decree the life or death of a people.

Great and powerful for ever, or stamped for ever with the sign of slavery; recognised by the nations as free men and brothers, or condemned to the nullity of men governed by the caprice of others; masters of yourselves, of your own homes, your own altars and your own sepulchres, or chattels, the by-word of every tyrant; destined to an immortality of glory or of shame—the choice rests with yourselves. You will be judged by God and man according to your choice.

Be great—decree your victory. The people gave victory to Spain, to Greece, to Switzerland; let the people give it to Italy. Let your chief magistrates and the extraordinary commissioners organize the insurrection; let them assemble from province to province, carry round and interpret the inspiration of Rome; let them assume exceptional powers and decree extreme remedies in cases of extreme peril. Let the chief who hesitates or

capitulates before giving battle, be declared a criminal: the province that allows the enemy to enter unresisted; be cancelled from the list of the republican territories. Let him who does not in some way struggle against the enemy, be infamous; let him who, were it even for an instant, takes part with them, be deprived for ever either of his country or his life. Let those who yield up any material of war to the enemy, be chastised; chastised all who do not endeavour to rob them of food, lodging, and rest—chastised all who do not abandon, if able, the soil they tread. Let the army bearing a foreign flag find itself encircled by a circle of fire, or a desert. Let the Republic, hitherto gentle and generous, arise tremendous and terrible in anger. Rome will stand firm.

21*st May* 1849.

[Counter proposition of the Triumvirate to the French Proposition.]

XX.

To M. Lesseps.

Sir,—I had the honour to transmit to you in my note of the 16th, some details as to the unanimity which marked the inauguration of the Republic. It is now necessary to speak to you of the actual question as it exists *de facto* if not *de jure*, between the French Government and our own.

You will, we hope, allow us to speak with the frankness required equally by the urgency of the case, and by those international sympathies which should animate the relations between France and Italy. Our only diplomacy consists of truth; and the character given to your mission, is, Sir, a pledge that what we have to say will be received in the best possible spirit. Allow me

to go back for a moment to the origin of the present state of things.

After certain conferences and arrangements, which took place some time back between the European Catholic Powers, without the Roman Government being called upon to take any part therein, it was decided:

1st, That a political modification in the government and institutions of the Roman State had become necessary; 2d, That the basis of this modification should be the return of Pius IX., not only as Pope—to this we offer no opposition—but as temporal sovereign and prince; 3d, That if in order to achieve this aim an intervention were necessary, that intervention should take place.

We are happy to admit that while the sole aim of some of the parties to this agreement was a dream of the re-edification and absolute return to the treaties of 1815, the French Government was only drawn into the agreement in consequence of erroneous information, depicting the Roman States as a prey to anarchy and to a state of terror exercised by an audacious minority.

We know, moreover, that in the proposed modification, the French Government intended to represent a more or less liberal influence, opposed to the despotic programme of Naples and Austria. Nevertheless, whether in a tyrannical or constitutional form, with or without the guarantees of a certain amount of liberty to the Roman population,—the predominating idea of all the contracting parties was a return towards the past; a compromise between Pius IX., considered as Temporal Sovereign, and the Roman people. The French invasion was—it would be useless to conceal the fact—planned and executed with this idea. Its double purpose was, on the one hand, to cast the sword of France into the

balance of the agreement to be initiated in Rome; and on the other hand, to ensure the Roman people against all retrograde excesses; but always regarding the reconstitution of a Constitutional Monarchy in favour of the Pope, as a fundamental point. This purpose is clearly proved, not only by the exact details we have had of the anterior negotiations, but also by the proclamations of General Oudinot, the formal declarations of all the Envoys sent one after the other to the Triumvirate, and the obstinate silence maintained whenever we have attempted to treat the political question, and to obtain a formal declaration of the fact certified in our note of the 16th—namely, *that the institutions by which the Roman people are actually governed, are the free and spontaneous expression of the inviolable will of the people legally interrogated.* And the vote of the French Assembly implicitly confirms the fact we assert.

In the face of such a state of things, in the face of the menace of a compromise which could not be accepted, and of negotiations which are in no way warranted by the condition of our populations, our course could not be doubtful. Resistance was a duty alike towards our country, towards France, and towards Europe.

We were bound, in order to fulfil a mandate loyally bestowed and loyally accepted, to maintain to the utmost of our power the inviolability of our country, of its territory, and of the institutions unanimously proclaimed by all the powers and elements of the State.

We were bound to gain sufficient time to enable us to appeal from France deceived, to France better informed, and to spare the sister Republic the remorse of having, by yielding to foreign influence, rendered herself an accomplice in an act of violence and oppression which has no parallel save the first dismemberment of Poland.

And we owed it to Europe to bear our testimony as far as in us lay, in favour of the fundamental principle of all international life,—the independence of each people in all that regards its internal administration. By resisting with enthusiasm the attempts of the Neapolitan Monarchy and our eternal enemy Austria,—by resisting, with deep sorrow, the arms of France, we are proud to declare that we have deserved well, not only of yourselves, but of the peoples of Europe.

You are aware, Sir, of the events that followed after the French intervention. Our territory was invaded by the troops of the King of Naples, and 4000 Spaniards set sail (probably on the 17th) to attack our coasts. The Austrians, having overcome the heroic resistance of Bologna, are advancing upon the Romagna, and threaten Ancona. We have repulsed from our territory the forces of the King of Naples. We shall do the same—such is our conviction—with the Austrian forces, if the attitude of the French troops does not prevent us from acting.

We speak in sorrow. But it is necessary that France should at last know the true results of the expedition to Civita Vecchia, which was undertaken, if we are to believe the assertions made to us, with a view of protecting us.

We declare, Sir, that of all the interventions undertaken to our injury, the intervention of France has been the most fatal to us. We are willing to fight the troops of the King of Naples and the Austrians; we are unwilling to fight the French. As regards them we are not in a state of *war*, but merely of *defence*. Such will continue to be our attitude whenever we find ourselves confronted with France. But that attitude—it is useless to deny it—has for us all the evils of war, without any of its possible advantages.

The French expedition rendered indispensable that concentration of our forces which laid open our frontier to the Austrian invasion, and left Bologna and the cities of Romagna disarmed. The Austrians took advantage of this. After a struggle heroically sustained for eight days by the population, Bologna was compelled to succumb.

We purchased arms for our defence in France; 10,000 of these muskets were sequestrated between Civita Vecchia and Marseilles; they are in your hands. By depriving us of these arms, you have deprived us of 10,000 soldiers, because every armed man would have become a soldier against the Austrians.

Your forces are posted within gunshot distance beneath our wall, in order of siege. They obstinately maintain that threatening position without any declared aim or programme; obliging us to maintain the city in a state of defence, which is financially very heavy upon us, and taking away all possibility of sending our troops to preserve our provinces from the occupation and devastation of Austria.

Were our people less good and devoted, the excited state of men's minds might lead to fatal consequences. If the attitude of your troops has not given rise to anarchy or reaction, it is simply because neither is possible in Rome; but it does produce great irritation against France; and that is a great misfortnne for us, who have hitherto regarded her with affection and hope.

We are besieged, Sir, besieged by France under cover of a mission of protection, while at a few leagues' distance the King of Naples is carrying off our hostages, and the Austrians are massacring our brothers.

You, Sir, have made propositions. Those propositions were declared inadmissible by the Assembly, and it would be useless for us to discuss them. To-day you

have added another to them. France, you say, *will protect against foreign invasion all those portions of the Roman territory occupied by her troops.* This fourth proposition in no way changes our position. The portion of territory you occupy is already protected, by that fact, against every other invasion; but if viewed with regard to the present, that portion is of the very smallest importance; and if viewed with regard to the future, have we no other means of protecting our soil save that of abandoning the whole of it to you?

But this is not the true point of the question: the whole question lies in the occupation of Rome. And this is the condition placed by you at the head of all your propositions. Now we have the honour to tell you, Sir, that that condition is impossible; our people would never consent to it. If the aim of the occupation of Rome be no other than that of protecting her, our people will be grateful to you, but will tell you that being able to protect Rome themselves, they would regard themselves as dishonoured in your eyes if they were to declare themselves so impotent as to render the aid of a few French regiments necessary for the defence of their city. If the occupation of Rome has—which God forbid—a political aim, the people, who have freely chosen their institutions, cannot submit to accept it. Rome is their capital, their palladium, their sacred city. They know that the occupation would not only entail a principle violated, and honour betrayed, but produce a civil war. And all insistence on your part augments their suspicion; they foresee that if foreign troops were admitted, the inevitable result would be a change, both of institutions and of men, fatal to their liberties.

The people have the example of Civita Vecchia before their eyes, and they know that if once surrounded by

foreign bayonets, the independence of the Assembly and the Government would be an empty name.

Upon that point, Sir, you may believe me, their determination is irrevocable. They will never succumb until they have covered their barricades with corpses. Will, can, the French soldiers massacre a people of brothers whom they declare themselves come to protect, because they refuse to yield up their capital to their arms?

France has only three courses before her in the Roman States.

To declare herself with us, against us, or neutral. To declare herself with us signifies that she must formally recognise our republic, and combat side by side with our troops against Austria.

To declare herself against us signifies to crush for no reason the national life of a friendly nation, and to fight side by side with Austria.

France *cannot* do this, and she *will* not risk involving herself in an European war in order to defend us as an ally. Let her then remain neutral in the struggle we have to sustain. A short time back we hoped other things of her; now, this is all we ask of her.

The occupation of Civita Vecchia is an accomplished fact. France believes that in the actual state of things it does not become her to remain at a distance from the field of battle; and she thinks that, whether as conquerors or conquered, we may have need of her protection and moderating influence. We do not believe this; but we shall not re-act against her for this; let her then keep Civita Vecchia; let her extend, if the number of her troops renders it necessary, her cantonments in that salubrious territory lying between Civita Vecchia and Viterbo,—and let her await, unmoved, the final issue of

our war. We offer her all the facilities possible, and every possible proof of loyal friendship. Her officers will be permitted to enter Rome as visitors; her soldiers shall receive, if need be, both assistance and comfort from us; but let her neutrality be sincere and without disguise, frankly and explicitly declared. Let her leave us free to dispose of our forces without fear of her. Let her give us back the arms we purchased. Let not her ships close our ports to those Italians who may come from other parts of Italy to share our dangers. Let her remove all her troops from beneath our walls, and thus cease all appearance of hostility between two peoples destined, we cannot doubt it, in future years to be united in the same international faith, as they are even now united in the adoption of the same form of Government.—Accept, Sir, etc.

25th May, 1849.

[Proclamation for the formation of a Polish Legion in Rome.]

XXI.

Whereas it is the duty of Rome, both from her past traditions and her future mission, to extend as far as possible her own life and liberty to all those who suffer, combat and hope in the cause of the nations and of humanity;

Whereas through her sufferings, her energy in sacrifice, and her immortal hopes, Poland is sister to Italy and sacred among the nations;

Whereas the Polish exiles are the representatives of the Poland of the future;

The Triumvirate decrees:—

1. A Polish legion is formed upon the Roman

territory, which will combat beneath the Roman standard for Italian independence.

2. The legion will adopt their own national flag, with the Italian tricolor scarf. The word of command will be in Polish, the uniform, etc. . . . . .

3. The legion will consist of two thousand men and upwards.

The Government of the Republic will, if necessary, provide means of transport for the recruits. Slavonians joining the Republican army will be incorporated in this legion.

4. The legion will elect its own officers. The military chief will present the list of names to the Government, who will then make choice. The Commander must be a Pole, elected by universal suffrage among the troops.

5. The pay of the legion will be the same as that of the Roman army. Those wounded or mutilated in defending the Republic will have the same rights as the wounded or mutilated citizens of the State.

6. The legion will be bound to one year's service, with power to prolong their obligations to military service from year to year for six years.

Should the Polish war of independence recommence, so that the legion should be able to consecrate their services to their own country, they will be free to do so, and to quit the territory of the Republic, first giving the Government notice of their intention.

29*th May* 1849.

[Answer to the Declaration of Lesseps of May 29, reproducing, with slight alterations, the same propositions alluded to in document No. xix.]

XXII.

Sir,—We have received the declaration sent by you on the 29th May. As the Assembly, to whom a copy of that declaration was transmitted, has reconfirmed the authority already given us to negotiate, the duty of answering you devolves upon us, and we hasten to fulfil it. If we have delayed answering your note of the 26th, be good enough to remember that it neither contained any proposition made in the name of France, nor discussed those sent by ourselves.

We have carefully examined your propositions, and the following are the modifications we propose. They are rather modifications in form than in substance :—

We might develop at length the causes of the changes we propose—changes required, we beg you to believe, not only by the instructions we have received from the Assembly, but also by the explicit vote of our people, against whose will any convention would be impossible: but time presses, and we cannot therefore enter into details. We prefer to trust to your own good faith and to the favour with which you have already shown us that you regard our cause and our acts, to supply this omission. Ours, Sir, is not, it cannot be, *diplomacy;* it is a frank and cordial appeal from a people to a people, made without menace, and without hidden design. France, above all other nations, is capable of hearing and understanding that appeal.

It would be inconceivable that the abnormal state of things now existing between the French Republic and ourselves should continue; especially after the recent declarations of your Assembly, and recent manifestations of your people with regard to us. And the proposal tending to put a stop to that state of things, is

sent to you, Sir, with all the earnestness of conviction and of purpose of which we are capable. Accept it as sacred, for it is the summing up of the unalterable faith and warmest wishes of a people, small in numbers, but brave and loyal; who remember who their fathers were, and the deeds they did on earth, and who, in combating now for the sacred cause of liberty and independence, are irrevocably resolved to be worthy of them. This people, Sir, has a right to be understood by France, and to find in her a support, and not a hostile power. They have a right to receive from her, not *protection*, but fraternity. Any demand for protection uttered by this people would be interpreted by Europe as a cry of despair, as a declaration of impotence, rendering them unworthy of that friendship from France upon which they had relied until recent events. No cry of despair will ever issue from their lips. There is no impotence for a people that knows how to die; and it would ill become a great and generous nation to misconceive the noble motives of the people of Rome.

It is necessary, Sir, that this state of things should cease. At present, *fraternity* between us is an empty word, void of all practical meaning. Let it become a reality. Allow our couriers, our arms, and our troops, to pass as freely over our territory as is necessary for our defence. Let not the Romans be compelled, as now, to regard with suspicion men whom they have been accustomed to consider as friends. Leave the path open for us to use all our means of defence against the Austrians, who are bombarding our cities. Let there be no longer any doubt as to the righteous and loyal intentions of France. Let it no longer be possible for Europe to declare that France takes from us the means of defending ourselves, in order hereafter to impose upon

us a protection through which our territory would be preserved from violation by others, through the loss of the things we hold most dear—our liberty and our honour.

Do this, Sir. The difficulties which now divide us will disappear; the affection, now lost, will revive; and France will again acquire that right to offer us counsel, of which her present hostile attitude deprives her.

The cantonments which we think most suitable, extend along the line from Frascati to Velletri.—Accept, Sir, etc.

30*th May* 1849.

The following are our proposals:—

1st, The Romans, confiding now as formerly in the fraternal support of the French Republic, require the cessation of all real or apparent hostility, and the establishment of such relations as shall evidence that fraternal support.

2d, The 5th Article of the French Constitution is for Romans a guarantee of the free exercise of their political rights.

3d, The French army shall be regarded by the Romans as a friendly army, and received as such according to an agreement to be made with the Government of the Roman Republic; they will be stationed in suitable cantonments, adapted alike to the necessities of the defence of the country, and the health of the troops. The French army will remain extraneous to the administration of the country. Rome is sacred alike to friends and foes. The city will form no part of the cantonments of the French troops. Her brave people are her best defence.

4th, The French Republic will defend the territory occupied by its troops against all foreign invasion.

[The above proposals having been, with some slight modification in form, accepted by the French Plenipotentiary, M. Lesseps—General Oudinot—alleging that he had secret instructions—refused to ratify the agreement, broke the truce, and signified his intention to besiege the city; promising, however, that he would not begin the attack before Monday. He then began the attack *on the night between Saturday and Sunday.*

[The Triumvirs then issued the following proclamation:—]

XXIII.

Romans.—To the crime of assailing a friendly Republic with Republican troops, General Oudinot has added the infamy of treachery. He has violated his written promise, now in our hands, *that he would not commence the attack before Monday.*

Romans, arise! To the walls, to the gates, to the barricades! Let us show the enemy that not even treachery can vanquish Rome.

Let the whole city rise up with the energy of one sole idea. Let every man fight, and every man have faith in victory. Remember your fathers and be great.

Let right triumph, and eternal infamy weigh upon the ally of Austria! Long live the Republic!

3d June 1849.

[Proclamation of the Triumvirs after the combat of the 3d June.]

XXIV.

Romans.—You have sustained the honour of Rome, the honour of Italy. For more than fourteen hours you have fought like veteran troops. Suddenly surprised by treachery, by the violation of a promise formally signed;

you have contested the ground inch by inch, regained positions for an instant lost, repulsed the bravest troops in Europe, and met death with a smile. May God bless you, guardians of the honour of your forefathers, as we, proud of having rightly judged the elements of greatness within you, bless you in the name of Italy.

Romans! this day is a day of heroes, a page of history.

Yesterday we said to you, be great; to-day we say to you, *you are great.* Continue such. Be constant.

Of the Roman people one may ask miracles. And we say with perfect trust in the people, in the national guard, and in the youth of every class, that Rome is inviolable. Watch over her walls this night; within those walls is the future of the nation. Watch while they who for fourteen hours have fought, repose. To the gates! to the barricades! The angel of your land watches with you; and the angel of your land is the angel of the Italian nation. Long live the Republic!

3*d June* 1849.

[Decree providing accommodation for those families whose dwellings were endangered by the bombardment.]

XXV.

Roman daughters of the people.—Your husbands, brothers, and sons, are fighting your country's enemies upon the walls; you have a right to the love and protection of your country. The enemy who retreated yesterday before our men, now threaten your dwellings with their bombs. You are Romans; you cannot tremble at their impotent threats. Our troops will hold the enemy afar; they will, if need be, join your dear ones on the barricades; but Rome owes protection to

the aged mothers, and to the children of her defenders. The Triumvirate therefore decrees:—

Those families of the people whose houses may be endangered by the bombardment, during the siege of to-morrow—shall to-morrow, or, if need be, before, be lodged by the Government in such houses, palaces, or convents, as are out of all danger.

The representatives of the people in every quarter of the city shall receive their applications for lodgings, verify the necessity, and give tickets of admission to the various localities chosen; a list of these will be given to them with the requisite instructions by the Minister of the Interior.

The Triumvirate trusts to the virtue and patriotism of the Roman women to keep vigilant order, and to preserve the habitations assigned to them from injury.

5th June 1849.

[So [illegible] was the self-respect inspired among the people by finding themselves respected by their rulers, that the trust reposed in them was completely justified by the event. The most scrupulous care was taken by these poor families of the furniture and effects in the palaces and convents wherein they were housed. Even where the palaces thus occupied were the property of nobles who had espoused the cause of the Pope and were therefore regarded as enemies of the country, the owners, on their return to Rome at the restoration, found every article of value—down to the rings and brooches they had left upon their dressing-tables at the time of their flight to Gaëta—uninjured.]

[The following lines were Mazzini's answer to a last summons from General Oudinot, when the French were already in possession of the first bastion on the left of the gate of S. Pancrazio.]

XXVI.

We have the honour to transmit to you the answer of the Assembly to your communication of the 12th.

We will never betray our word. In execution of the orders of the Assembly and the Roman people, we have promised to defend the banner of the Republic, the honour of the country, and the sanctity of the capital of the Christian world: we will keep our promise.—Receive, General, etc.

13*th June* 1849.

[The following is Mazzini's answer to a letter addressed by M. de Corcelles, envoy extraordinary of the French Republic, to M. de Gerando, Chancellor of the French embassy in Rome. The letter attempted to excuse the flagrant contradiction between the agreement of Lesseps and the assault upon Rome by General Oudinot.]

XXVII.

Sir,—The letter written to you by M. de Corcelles, dated the 13th, and which you have politely communicated to me, does not in any way invalidate, as you must admit, the answer given by the Roman Constituent Assembly to General Oudinot. The date of this or that French despatch, is of little moment; it is of little moment whether M. Lesseps was or was not recalled at the moment he affixed his signature to the convention of the 31st May.

Everything may be answered in one word! *the Assembly had never had any official communication of those despatches, and was in ignorance of them.*

The diplomatic question then, as far as we are concerned, may be stated in these terms:—

M. Lesseps was the French plenipotentiary in Rome. He was such to us on the 31st May, as much as he was before. No information or warning had been conveyed to us of any modification or suppression of his powers. We therefore treated with him in perfect good faith, as if treating with France; and to this good faith we owed the occupation of Monte Mario by the French troops on the night of the 28-29th May. Engaged in a perfectly pacific discussion with M. Lesseps; anxious to avoid everything tending to create an impression contrary to the true wishes of our people, and not being able to persuade ourselves that France's mission of protection would be commenced by the siege of Rome, we viewed these incidents unmoved. At every movement of your troops, every operation tending to narrow the military circle, and gradually approach positions which we might have defended, M. Lesseps hastened to assure us that the sole object of the French in those operations was to give a vent to the feverish excitement of the troops, weary of their long inaction; he implored us, in the name of the two countries, in the name of humanity, to avoid all conflict, to trust in him, and to fear no evil consequences from those unusual movements. And we yielded with confidence to his entreaties. At present I am constrained to repent my part in that confidence; not that I fear for Rome, but because now our brave men have to defend with their own breasts, all that those good positions might have defended for them. On the 31st May, at eight o'clock in the evening, the convention between ourselves and M. Lesseps was signed. He carried it with him to the camp, assuring us that he regarded the signature of General Oudinot as a mere formality about which no doubt could exist. We were all joyful in spirit.

It appeared as if affairs were about to resume their natural course between France and ourselves.

During the night, the despatch of General Oudinot reached us, refusing his adhesion to the agreement, and declaring that M. Lesseps, in signing it, had exceeded his powers.

A second despatch, dated the 1st June, 3½ P.M., signed by the General, declared to us that events had justified his determination, and that by two despatches from the ministry of war and the ministry of foreign affairs, dated 28th and 29th May, the French Government had announced to him the recall of M. Lesseps.

Twenty-four hours were allowed us to accept the *ultimatum* of the 29th May.

You are aware that on the same day M. Lesseps addressed a communication to us, saying: "I maintain the Convention signed yesterday. I am starting for Paris to obtain its ratification. That agreement was concluded in virtue of instructions which empowered me to occupy myself exclusively with the negotiations and relations to be established with the authorities and population of Rome."

On the same day, at a late hour, General Oudinot declared to us that he should recommence hostilities, but that, at the request of the Chancellor of the French Embassy, the attack would be deferred until Monday morning at the earliest.

We were attacked on Sunday,* and the consequence of this violation of faith was the occupation of Villa Pamfili, and the surprise of two companies, which will doubtless form part of the *bulletin* of the 3d. Those two hundred men, together with twenty-four prisoners

* The night between Saturday and Sunday.

made during that day's battle, are now at Bastia, in Corsica.

After these things, pray tell me, Sir, of what import to us is the despatch of the 26th May, quoted in the letter of M. de Corcelles? What are the despatches quoted by General Oudinot? We never saw those despatches; we know not what they contain; we have had no official information of their existence. On the one side we have the affirmation of General Oudinot; on the other that of the minister plenipotentiary—they contradict each other. Let France unfold this coil, and save her own honour if she can. Placed between a minister plenipotentiary, and a General of division, our Assembly has thought fit to conform to the history of the facts established by that plenipotentiary. I agree with its decision, and remind you, Sir, that only to-day, the tenth day of the siege, has the presence of M. de Corcelles in the camp, with the attributes of minister extraordinary, been indirectly made known to us.

Reflect, Sir, upon the date of those official notes; compare them with the occupation of Monte Mario, and the other operations of the French army, and then tell us whether, on a calm examination of the diplomatic question, Europe will not be obliged to say: "The object of the French Government was to deceive the Roman Government. General Oudinot took advantage of the good faith of the Roman Government, to narrow the circle of assault, and occupy favourable positions, so as to facilitate taking possession of the city. Either the despatch of the 26th has no real existence, or it was not communicated in time to M. Lesseps." The despatch of the 29th May was in fact known in the French camp on the morning of the 1st June; that of the 26th might therefore have been in General Oudinot's hands on the

29th. The fact that the General did not then produce it, so as to suspend the negotiations and the powers of the negotiator, suggests the idea that he intended to take advantage of those negotiations, which diminished alike the vigilance and the power of the Roman people, in order, little by little, to make himself master of the best positions without resistance, certain as he was of putting a stop to all negotiations, when it suited him, by revealing the despatch of the 26th, and to break the truce as soon as he was ready to attack.

Allow me, Sir, to say to you with the freedom that befits a man of a frank and not servile nature, that the conduct of the Roman Government in the negotiations that took place never departed a single line from the path of honour. The Government of France would find it difficult to affirm so much. This in no way affects France, thank God; the proud and generous nation is, like ourselves, the victim of a base intrigue.

Your cannon are now thundering against our walls; your bombs are falling upon the sacred city. France had to-night the honour of killing a poor girl of the Transtevere, sleeping by her sister's side. Our young officers, our improvised soldiers, our people fall beneath your shots to the cry of *Viva la Republica!* The brave soldiers of France fall to no cry, in silence, like men dishonoured. I feel sure that there is not a single heart amongst you that does not secretly declare what your deserters declared to us yesterday: *we know not what voice within us tells us we are fighting against brothers.*

Wherefore this bloodshed among brothers? I know not: you know not. The banner of France has no concern here, she fights against men who love her, and who but a few days since trusted in her. She is seeking to set fire to a city which has in no way injured her,

without any political programme, without any determinate aim, without any right to exercise, any duty to fulfil. She is, through her generals, playing the game of Austria, and without having even the evil courage to confess as much. She is dragging her banner through the mud of the conciliabules of Gaeta, and shrinking from a frank confession of her work of priestly restoration. M. de Corcelles no longer ventures to speak of anarchy or faction, but writes—like a man disturbed in mind—these senseless words:—

"The aim of France is the liberty of the revered head of the church, the liberty of the Roman states, and the peace of the world!"

We at least know what we are fighting for, and we are strong because we do know it. If France were here to represent a principle among us, one of those ideas which make a nation great, and which made her great in the past, the valour of her sons would not be spent against our youthful soldiers.

It is a sad page, Sir, which your generals are inscribing in the history of France; it is a mortal blow to that papacy you pretend to protect, but which you are really smothering in blood; it is a gulf that cannot be closed, which you are digging between two nations that were meant to advance together for the good of all men, and who have for centuries held out their hands towards each other, eager for fellowship; it is a tremendous violation of that morality which should rule the relations between people and people; of the common faith which should be their guide; of the sacred cause of liberty which lives by that faith; of the future—not of Italy, her sufferings are the baptism of her progress—but of France, which cannot maintain her place in the front rank of the nations

save through the manly virtues of good faith and liberty rightly understood.

15th June 1849.

[" The idea of prolonging the struggle so long as a man and gun remained," says Mazzini, "was to my mind so elementary, that I proposed as soon as matters should become desperate in Rome itself, that we Triumvirs, accompanied by the Ministers, the Assembly, (or if not all of it a numerous delegation), and such of the population as might choose to follow us, should issue forth from the city in company with our little army; by which means its movements would be given a legal authority and prestige in the eyes of the population. My plan then was that rapidly leaving Rome behind us, we should provision ourselves in the Aretino, fling ourselves on the Austrian line of operations between Bologna and Ancona, and endeavour, by a first victory, to raise the Romagna. The French would then occupy Rome, but without having conquered the Republic; nor could they have pursued us and fought us upon the new ground thus chosen, without completely unmasking the whole infamy of their invasion before the eyes of France and of Europe. It was the same plan which Garibaldi attempted to execute later on, but with only a few thousand followers collected at random from the different troops, without the prestige and authority of the government, without artillery, and in conditions which rendered success impossible."

On the 30th June, the French General being master of the bastions and of all the heights round Rome, formally summoned the city to surrender. Mazzini called a council of war to hear the opinions of the military leaders before communicating with the assembly,

and pointed out to them that there were three courses open to them: to adopt the plan described above,—to resist until the city were in ruins—or to capitulate. The Roman leaders were for the second course; the General in Chief—Roselli—the chief of the Staff—Pisacane, and Garibaldi, voted for Mazzini's plan; no one voted for capitulation. Mazzini then proposed his plan to the Assembly as the only course worthy of Rome. Garibaldi, however, declared to the Assembly that further defence was impossible, and the Assembly, discouraged, lacked the energy to adopt the proposal. "Some of the members of the Assembly afterwards blamed me," says Mazzini, "for not having previously prepared their minds for the decision; but the singular calmness and truly Roman energy they had shown until that moment had induced me to believe that they would hail the proposition with applause."

Mazzini had left the Assembly when the vote was passed to issue the following decree.]

ROMAN REPUBLIC.

In the name of God and the People, the Roman constituent Assembly decrees that all defence shall cease, as henceforth impossible, and remains at its post.

The Triumvirate is charged with the execution of the present decree.

A. SALICETI, *President.*
PENNACHI, FABRETTI, ZAMBRIANCHI, COCCHI, } *Secretaries.*

ROME, *June 30th* 1849.

[The Assembly forwarded the decree to the Triumvirate, desiring them to forward it to the French General, and to treat with him for the maintenance of order and

personal security in the conquered city. The Triumvirate resigned rather than execute the decree. For Mazzini's protest, saying that he had been elected a Triumvir to defend, not to destroy the Republic, see page 97.]

[Proclamations of the Triumvirate after the decree of the Assembly ordering the cessation of the defence.]

XXVIII.

Romans,—The Triumvirate has voluntarily resigned. The Constituent Assembly will communicate to you the names of their successors.

The Assembly, after the successes obtained yesterday by the enemy, moved by a desire to spare the Romans the last extreme of danger, and to prevent the useless sacrifice of more valuable lives, has decreed that the defence shall be discontinued. The men who have directed the struggle could ill direct the coming state of things. Their mission is practically ended, and they hasten to resign their mandate into the hands of the Assembly.

Romans, brothers,—you have inscribed an indelible page in history, which will remain a proof of the latent energy within you, and of the greatness of your future destiny, of which no power can deprive you. You have given a baptism of glory, and a consecration of noble blood to that new life now dawning upon Italy,—the Collective life; the life of a people that *wills* to exist, and will exist. Gathered beneath the Republican flag, you have redeemed the honour of our common country, elsewhere contaminated by the arts of the wicked, and by monarchical impotence. Your Triumvirs come back to you as simple citizens, bearing with them a supreme consolation in the consciousness of the purity of their

intentions, and the honour of having their names associated with your noble deeds.

A cloud has arisen between you and your future; a temporary cloud. Stand firm in the consciousness of your rights, and in the faith for which so many of your best men have died armed apostles. God, who has treasured up their blood, is your security. God wills that Rome shall be free and great, and she will be such. Yours is no defeat,—it is the victory of martyrs, whose sepulchre is a stepping-stone to Heaven. When the heaven of your resurrection shall beam above you; when, at no distant day, the price of the sacrifices you have so cheerfully made in the cause of honour shall be counted to you, may you then remember the men who lived for months your own life, who suffer now in your suffering, and will fight again to-morrow, if it may be, among your ranks. Long live the Roman Republic!

30th June 1849.

XXIX.

Romans,—Your city has been overcome by brute force, but your rights are neither lessened nor changed. The Roman Republic lives eternally inviolable in the suffrages of the men by whom it was proclaimed; in the spontaneous adhesion of all the elements of the State; in the faith of the peoples who have admired our long defence; in the blood of the martyrs who have fallen beneath our walls for its sake. Our invaders betray their solemn promises as they list. God does not betray. Be you constant and faithful to the faith of your hearts in the trial which He wills you should for a while endure, and do not despair of the future. Brief are the dreams of violence; infallible the triumph of a people that hopes, combats and suffers in the cause of justice and holy liberty.

You have given brilliant proof of military courage; now give proof of moral courage. By all you hold sacred, citizens, keep yourselves incontaminate, free from weak fear or base egotism. Let the division between yourselves and your invaders remain evident to all men. Let Rome be their camp, not their city. And brand with the name of traitor to Rome, he who from whatever compromise with his own conscience, passes over to the enemy's camp. The destinies of Europe render it impossible that Rome should remain the conquest of France, or of whomsoever.

Let not, this French occupation lose its character of violence and conquest. Isolate the enemy. Europe will raise a powerful voice in your favour. Meanwhile, none can hinder the pacific expression of your will. Organize such pacific manifestation. Let your municipalities unceasingly declare with calm firmness *that they voluntarily adhered to the Republican form of government, and the abolition of the Temporal Power of the Pope; and that they regard as illegal whatsoever government may be imposed without the free approval of the people*: then, if necessary, let them resign. From every quarter of Rome, from every provincial city, let lists be issued, signed by thousands of names, bearing testimony to the same faith, invoking the same right. In the streets, the theatres, in every place of meeting, let the same cry be heard. *Away with the Government of Priests! Freedom of vote!* After that cry retire. When the Papal arms are again raised, let all who have taken the oath to the Republic, retire from their functions. Thousands cannot be imprisoned; men cannot be compelled to degrade themselves. And you would degrade yourselves, O Romans! you would degrade yourselves for ever, if, after having once declared to Europe that you were

determined to be free, and having fought and lost the best men among you to become such, you should resume your slavery and make any compact with defeat.

Your forefathers, Romans, were great, not so much because they knew how to conquer as because they never despaired when overcome.

In the name of God and the People, be you great as your forefathers. Now, as then, and more than then, you have a world—the Italian world—in your keeping. Your Assembly is not extinct; it is dispersed. Your Triumvirs—their public function suspended by the force of things,—are on the watch for the opportune moment—which will depend on your conduct—in order again to convene the Assembly.

5th July.

[After passing the decree declaring defence impossible, the Assembly remained at their post discussing the last articles of the Constitution, framed by Saliceti (a Neapolitan) under the supervision and guidance of Mazzini. The French army entered Rome on the 2d of July. At noon, on the 3d, the Constitution was publicly read from the Capitol, amid the enthusiastic applause of the people and shouts of *Viva la Republica.*]

CONSTITUTION OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.

Fundamental Principles.

I.

The Sovereignty exists, by right eternal, in the People. The people of the Roman States are constituted a democratic Republic.

II.

Democratic Government is ruled by equality, liberty

and fraternity. It recognizes no titles of nobility, no privilege of birth or caste.

III.

The Republic, by its laws and institutions aims at the improvement of the moral and material condition of all its citizens.

IV.

The Republic regards all the peoples as brothers; respects their nationality and defends that of Italy.

V.

The rights of all municipalities are equal; their independence is limited only by the laws affecting the general well-being of the State.

VI.

In the division of the territory of the Republic the most equitable distribution of local interests compatible with the political interest of the State will be observed.

VII.

The exercise of civil and political rights will be independent of Religious belief.

VIII.

The head of the Catholic Church will receive from the Republic every requisite guarantee for the independent exercise of his spiritual powers.

I.

Rights and Duties of Citizens.

1. Citizens of the Republic are:—

All who are born under the Republic;

All who had acquired the right of citizenship under the former laws;

All other Italians in virtue of a residence of six months;

Foreigners in virtue of a residence of ten years;

All who are naturalized by legislative decree.

2. The right of citizenship is lost:

By naturalization or settlement in a foreign country with the intention not to return;

By leaving the country in case of war, or after the country has been declared to be in danger;

By the acceptance of any foreign title;

By the acceptance of any foreign rank, employment, or military service without authorization from the government of the Republic. Such authorization may always be taken for granted in the case of fighting for the liberty of another people;

By any judicial condemnation.

3. Persons and property are inviolable;

4. No person can be arrested unless in *flagranti delicto*, or through a judge's warrant; nor withdrawn from judgment by his natural judges.

No exceptional court or commission can be instituted under any title or denomination whatsoever.

No person can be arrested for debt.

5. The penalties of death and of confiscation are abolished.

6. The domicile is sacred; all entrance therein is prohibited, except in such cases and under such formalities as are specified by the law.

7. All manifestation of thought is free; the abuse thereof is punished by the law, without any preventive censorship.

8. Instruction is free. The conditions of morality

and capacity required from those who adopt the profession of teachers are specified by the law.

9. The privacy of correspondence is inviolable.

10. The right of petition can be exercised both individually and collectively.

11. All citizens have the right of association, without arms, for any aim which is not criminal.

12. All citizens form part of the national guard, with the formalities and exceptions specified by the law.

13. No person can be compelled to yield up his property save for the public good, and on receipt of an equitable indemnity.

14. The expences of the Republic and the mode of contribution thereunto are specified by the law.

No tax can be imposed otherwise than by the law, nor collected for a longer period than that fixed by the law.

II.

Political Organization.

15. All power emanates from the people. It is exercised by the Assembly, the Consulate, and the Judicial Body.

III.

Of the Assembly.

16. The Assembly is composed of the representatives of the people.

17. Every citizen in the possession of his civil and political rights is an elector at twenty-one years of age, and eligible at twenty-five years of age.

18. No public functionary, nominated by the consuls or by the ministry, can be a representative of the people.

19. The number of representatives will be in the proportion of one to every 20,000 inhabitants.

20. The constituencies will meet every three years on the 21st April.

The people will then elect their representatives by universal, direct, and public suffrage.

21. The Assembly will meet on the 15th of May following the election. It will be re-elected every third year.

22. The Assembly will meet in Rome unless it decide otherwise; it has the disposal of whatever amount of armed force it may require.

23. The Assembly will be indissoluble a[illegible]anent, but possess the right to adjourn for such ti[illegible] it shall determine upon.

During the recess it may be convoked, in case of urgency, by summons from the President, from the Secretaries, from thirty of its members, or from the Consulate.

24. It will be legally constituted only when half the members, plus one, are present. Whatever the number of members present, the Assembly will decree the necessary measures for summoning the absent.

25. The sittings of the Assembly will be public.

It may resolve itself into a secret committee.

26. The representatives of the people are inviolable in respect of the opinions expressed in the Assembly. All *inquisition** upon this subject is forbidden.

27. All arrest or *inquisition* of a representative is forbidden, save in the case of *flagranti delicto*.

The Assembly, which must be at once made aware of

* This word is literally translated, because the English law has no analogous proceeding or term. It is the first judicial inquiry in a criminal case, and includes the examination of the accused person.

the fact, will decide whether the prosecution be continued or abandoned.

The above includes the case of a citizen elected a representative while under arrest.

28. Every representative will receive a salary, which he will not be permitted to refuse.

29. The legislative power will be vested in the Assembly. It will decide all questions of treaties and of peace or war.

30. The initiative of the laws belongs to the representatives and the consulate.

31. No proposition can become law unless adopted after two discussions, taking place at an interval of not less than ten days. In case of urgency, the Assembly can lessen the interval.

32. All laws passed by the Assembly will be immediately promulgated by the Consulate in the name of God and the people. Should the Consulate delay to do this, the President of the Assembly will promulgate the law.

IV.

Of the Consulate and Ministries.

33. The Consuls will be three in number. They will be chosen by a majority of two-thirds of the Assembly.

They must be citizens of the Republic, and thirty years of age.

They will be elected for three years. One Consul will retire every year, the choice being determined by lot.

No Consul can be re-elected within three years after the cessation of his functions.

35. The Consulate will appoint seven ministers.

1. Minister of the Interior.
2. " of Foreign Affairs.

3. Minister of the Army and Navy.
4. ,, of Finance.
5. ,, of Grace and Justice.
6. ,, of Agriculture, Commerce, Industry, and Public Works.
7. Minister of Public Worship, Instruction, Fine Arts and Beneficence.

36. The Consuls will be charged with the administration of the laws and of international relations.

37. The Consuls have the appointment to all non-elective offices. They will remove and replace the officials, but every nomination or removal will take place in council with the ministry.

38. The decisions of the Consuls will not take effect unless countersigned by the minister charged with their execution. The signature of the Consuls will be sufficient for the nomination or removal of the ministers.

39. Every year, or when required to do so by the Assembly, the Consuls will present an *exposé* of the general state of affairs in the Republic.

40. The Ministers have the right of speaking in the Assembly on matters appertaining to their ministry.

41. The Consuls reside at the seat of the Assembly, and may not quit the territory of the Republic without authorization from the Assembly, under penalty of loss of office.

42. They will be lodged at the expense of the Republic, and receive a salary of 3600 crowns annually.

43. The Consuls and Ministers will be responsible.

44. The Consuls and Ministers may be impeached on the motion of ten representatives. The motion will be discussed as in the case of a law.

45. If the impeachment be agreed to, the Consul will be suspended from the exercise of his functions. If

acquitted, he will resume the exercise of his functions; if condemned, the Assembly will proceed to elect another Consul.

V.

Of the Council of state.

46. The Council of State will be composed of fifteen members, nominated by the Assembly.

47. The Council will be consulted by the consuls and ministers upon all projects of law, upon the regulations and ordinances of the executive power, and may also be consulted in respect of political relations.

48. The Council issues the necessary regulations in matters with regard to which it has received special delegation from the Assembly.

The other functions of the Council will be determined by a special law.

VI.

Of the Judicial Power.

49. In the exercise of their functions the judges hold their power solely from the state.

50. They are nominated by the consuls and a council of ministers, and are irremoveable. They can neither be promoted nor transferred without their own consent; neither suspended, degraded, nor dismissed without trial.

51. Civil cases are decided by the justiciary. Justice is administered publicly in the name of the people, but the tribunal, for reasons of morality, may order the court to be closed.

52. Criminal cases are judged by the people. The tribunals administer the law. The method of the institution of juries is determined by a special law.

53. A public ministry is attached to each of the tribunals of the Republic.

54. Consuls and ministers are tried by a High Court of Justice. This court is composed of a president, the four senior councillors of the Court of Cassation, and three jurors for each province, selected by lot from the annual lists.

55. The Assembly nominates the magistrate who will fulfil the duties of the public ministry attached to the High Court.

The accused can only be pronounced guilty by a majority of two-thirds.

VII.

Of the Public Forces.

56. The number of paid troops on land or sea is determined by law, and can only be augmented or reduced by law.

57. The army is recruited by voluntary enlistment, according to the methods established by law.

58. No foreign troops can be hired or introduced into the Republic without a decree of the Assembly.

59. Generals are nominated by the Consulate and appointed by the Assembly.

60. The distribution of the troops of the line and of the garrisons of the interior, is determined by the Assembly; they can neither be modified nor even temporarily transferred without the consent of the Assembly.

61. The national guard. . . . .

62. The maintenance of the constitution and of public order is chiefly confided to the national guard.

VIII.

63. No reform of the Constitution can be demanded before the last year of the existing Assembly, and must

be demanded by at least one-third of the representatives.

64. The Assembly will discuss the proposition twice, at an interval of two months. If the Assembly, by a majority of two-thirds, vote for the proposed reform, the electoral Assemblies will be convoked to elect the representatives of the constituent: one for every 15,000 of the population.

65. The assembly of revision is also the legislative assembly during the whole of its session. The session will last for three months.

Temporary Arrangements.

66. The labours of the actual Assembly will be especially directed to the formation of the electoral law and of the other organic laws necessary to the realization of the Constitution.

67. The mandate of the Constituent Assembly ceases as soon as the Legislative Assembly is convoked.

68. The existing laws and regulations remain in force until abrogated, and in all matters wherein they are not contrary to the Constitution.

69. All the actual employés are confirmed in their position.

Voted unanimously.

From the Capitol, this 1*st July* 1849.

L. GALLETTI, *President.*

A. SALICETI, E. ALLOCATELLI, } *Vice-Presidents.*

L. PENNACCHI, S. COCCHI, A. FABRETTI, A. ZAMBIANCHI, } *Secretaries.*

[On the evening of the 4th July, a battalion of the French infantry suddenly occupied the neighbourhood of the capital, entered the hall of the Assembly, drove out the deputies and closed the doors, in defiance of the protest signed by the section of the Assembly sitting *en permanence*, and placed in the hands of the French Colonel. The municipality, composed of ninety Roman citizens, remained the sole Roman authority in power until the day when, having been ordered by General Oudinot to present arms to the Pope, they unanimously decided to resign.]

TURNBULL AND SPEARS, PRINTERS.


00020590

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018